

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXI

JANUARY 1926

Number 1

THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN AND ABOUT GREECE IN THE SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.

By CARL DARLING BUCK

The flower of Greek civilization is a blend of pre-Greek Aegean and of Indo-European Greek elements, both of which are necessary to explain it. For no other of the Indo-European peoples (that is, peoples of IE speech) and conversely no other of the Oriental peoples achieved comparable results. The Indo-European invaders, bringing with them a crude civilization, certainly not superior to that of the Germanic tribes when they first became known to the Romans, came into the East Mediterranean region, where the material civilization was thousands of years in advance of that in the northern regions. They fell heir to it and profited by it—just as in the case of the Slavic migrations in the early centuries of our era the South Slavs, who entered lands within the confines of Graeco-Roman civilization, were the first to organize states and develop written languages, while the Northern Slavs remained illiterate tribes.

One side of the picture is the material civilization to which the Greek invaders fell heir. The other is what they brought with them. It was their language which prevailed, with all that language implies for national consciousness and intellectual development. Whatever the purely racial constituency of the historical Greeks, it is the linguistic descent that indicates also the main line of intellectual descent. It was the Greek mentality that enabled the Greeks to build, on the foundation of material civilization which they found prepared,

that perfected type of artistic and intellectual culture which is the glory of ancient Greece.

What were the affinities of the pre-Greek population, when did the Greeks enter the land and in what successive waves, when and how was the fusion of the Greek and pre-Greek elements effected? This is the outstanding problem, and one that is fascinating to a dangerous degree. For the kind of evidence necessary for a full and conclusive answer is lacking.

The archaeological discoveries from Schliemann's time to the present have disclosed the flourishing Mycenaean and the earlier and still more marvelous Cretan civilization, not to mention the Neolithic remains dating back perhaps untold millenniums. The Bronze Age civilization is assigned to certain main periods and subdivisions, and their approximate dates are determined by synchronism with Egyptian chronology. For Sir Arthur Evans' Early, Middle, and Late Minoan, the terms Early, Middle, and Late Helladic for the roughly corresponding periods on the mainland, and Early, Middle, and Late Cycladic for those of the Cyclades, have been proposed by Wace and Blegen (*BSA*, XXII, 175 ff.), and are likely to be adopted.

8/ Certainly it is of the utmost interest and importance that archaeologists should thus determine objectively the successive periods and what if any are the significant breaks in the continuity of development. On the other hand, historians are cautious, if not wholly skeptical, about drawing ethnological conclusions from the archaeological strata, since changes in material civilization may be due to other causes than a radical change of population, and conversely a change of population may occur in such a way as not to be marked by a distinct break in civilization.¹ None of the ambitious attempts to define ethnologically the prehistoric strata has carried conviction or won any general approval. There has been much juggling with names like Pelasgian, Minyan, and Achaean, with a mixture of true and untrue or misleading statements on linguistic matters. Ridgeway's *Early Age in Greece* was a conspicuous failure in this direction. The recent article of J. P. Harland ("The Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age," *Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, XXXIV [1923], 1 ff.) is a careful review of

¹ Cf. the remarks of E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, I, 2, 805 ff., and the jibe of Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, I, 1, 131, at the "kindliche Vorstellung dass jede neuere Kulturperiode durch eine Einwanderung herbeigeführt worden sei."

the archaeological evidence brought up to the minute, with an attempt to combine this with linguistic evidence and tradition and to interpret it in terms of migrations, namely the "Minyan Migration," the first of the Hellenic or Indo-European stock, about 2000 B.C., the "Archaian Invasion" about 1400 B.C., and the traditional "Dorian Invasion" about 1100 B.C. It is unfortunate that the author has adopted Beloch's view that the Achaeans were a first wave of Dorians, a theory that is contrary to every probability (of this later) and confuses the whole issue. We shall also find reason to question the date of his "Minyan Migration."

There is still a wide gulf in current opinion between those who believe that the first Greek invasion was as early as 2000 B.C. (Beloch, I, 1, 71; Meyer, I, 2, 808) and that this Greek element was soon dominant, and those who believe like Sir Arthur Evans (cf. *London Times*, April 8, 1924) that a language of Anatolian and Cretan affinities was that of the dominant population of Continental Greece down to the last days of the Mycenaean civilization, or like Dörpfeld that various non-Greek peoples still occupied parts of Greece in the late centuries of the second millennium B.C.

The reason why such a wide difference of opinion is possible is of course the lack of direct, conclusive linguistic evidence, that is of decipherable records in mainland Greece from the second millennium B.C. Yet it is the linguistic evidence, such as it is, that offers the most substantial approach to the question, and it is important to know how much or how little can be concluded from this. In spite of all that has been written, a restatement of the matter, with inclusion of the new evidence from Hittite inscriptions, may serve to clarify the problem.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of chronology, we consider first the affinities of pre-Greek speech. Here we are dependent on the indirect evidence of records which, with some exceptions to be noted, are from regions outside of the Greek mainland, and of what appear to be survivals of pre-Greek speech in the historical language.

The Cretan documents in hieroglyphics and two varieties of linear script are some two thousand in number, the great majority being in the linear script of type B, and cover a period from about 2000 B.C. to 1400 B.C., with some of even later date. Those in hieroglyphics are published with exhaustive discussion in Evans, *Scripta Minoa*, Volume I.

The full publication of the records in linear script is reserved for a later volume, but the script is illustrated and discussed in this first volume and in *The Palace of Minos*, I, 612 ff. (cf. also Sundwall, *Jhb. arch. Inst.*, 1915, pp. 41 ff.). There is reason to believe that the hieroglyphic signs, of which the number thus far ascertained is about one hundred thirty-five, were, like the Egyptian, used both as ideograms and with phonetic value, and that the same is true of the linear script, only with an increased proportion of phonetic use and consequent reduction in the number of signs to less than one hundred. Relationship between the Cretan linear and the Cyprian script was pointed out by Evans (*op. cit.*, pp. 70 ff.) and more fully demonstrated by Sundwall (*op. cit.*, pp. 57 ff.), who identifies thirty-three of the fifty-five signs of the Cyprian syllabary with signs of the Cretan linear. It is reasonably certain that the latter was once in use in Cyprus and was the basis of the syllabary, which was first used for a non-Greek language and was adopted by the later Greek-speaking population. This pre-Greek language of Cyprus survived locally as late as the fourth century B.C., like the Eteoeretan in Crete, and is represented by a half-dozen inscriptions, now most conveniently surveyed in *KZ*, LII, 194 ff.

But the Cretan writings have not been deciphered, and short of some unexpected aid such as a bilingual the prospect of their successful decipherment is not bright. One cannot assert positively that the language is not Greek, but in my judgment all attempts to show evidence of Greek (the last in *AJA*, 1924, pp. 124 ff.) are wholly unconvincing, the historical probability is against this, and the generally current opinion that the language is pre-Greek is not to be seriously questioned. Only for the latest records, belonging to Late Minoan III (*Scripta Minoa*, I, 54 ff.), one might consider the possibility that the earliest Greek settlers became acquainted with the linear script and employed it in writing Greek (cf. *ibid.*, p. 104, and *JHS*, XIV, 260). But it is more probable that these too are to be attributed to the surviving non-Greek element.

The strong suspicion that the language of these Cretan writings is related to those of Asia Minor is then not based on any internal evidence from the writings themselves, but upon indications of cultural relations between the early Cretan population and that of Asia Minor (cf. *Palace of Minos*, I, 45 ff.), and the evidence of place-names

in Crete as well as in other parts of the Aegean including the Greek mainland (cf. below, pp. 8 ff.).

The famous Phaistos Disk, written in hieroglyphic characters quite different from those otherwise known in Crete, is now generally recognized as an importation, probably from Southwestern Asia Minor (*ibid.*, pp. 647 ff.).

In parts of eastern Crete a non-Greek language survived as late as the fourth century B.C., as shown by the "Eteocretan" inscriptions of Praesos. These are in the Greek alphabet, one written boustrophedon with archaic forms of the letters¹ probably of the sixth century B.C., the other two in the Ionic alphabet of the fourth century B.C. Conway (*BSA*, VIII, 125 ff., and X, 115 ff.) has given the fullest discussion of these inscriptions, and concludes that the language is Indo-European. I am not in the least convinced of this. All three inscriptions are incomplete, the word division is known only in small part, and no word can be identified except the name of the city, which is evidently to be recognized in *φραιστοι*, *φραιστονα*. In this the φ beside the π of *Πραιστός* recalls the similar interchange of stops in names of pre-Greek and probably Anatolian origin (cf. *Glotta*, IV, 312, and below).

Scattered specimens of the Cretan linear script, with from one to four characters, have been found in Thera, Melos (a group of two signs corresponding to a recurring Cretan group), and at various Mycenaean centers on the Greek mainland, as Mycenae, Tiryns, and Orchomenos. The best of these is the stirrup-jar from Orchomenos, often reproduced, e.g. *Scripta Minoa*, I, 57. But all the previously known specimens together do not equal in extent and importance the remarkable find made by Keramopoullos at Thebes and now exhibited in the local museum, though as yet unpublished. Here is a huge col-

¹ The alphabet differs in some important respects from that of the early Greek inscriptions of central Crete. For λ the form is λ̣ not λ. We have Λ with vocalic value and so doubtless the inverted form of V, as in the Venetic alphabet. The Ξ, lacking in the Cretan alphabet, occurs, with value undetermined, but almost certainly not that which it had in the Ionic dialect. One thinks of its early sporadic use for ζ (ΞΒΥΜ = Ζεὺς at Corinth, ΞΕΥΜ in Thera) and its use for a nasal in the Lycian and Lydian alphabets. One letter has precisely the form of the Phrygian and Lemnian zeta, namely Ϸ, but as it stands between consonants it is thought by both Conway and Comparetti to be a variety of the crooked iota. The Ϸ is more probably π (Comparetti) than γ (Conway).

lection of stirrup-jars, of which a dozen or more are inscribed, the number of signs on each ranging from two or three to thirteen or fourteen. Sir Arthur Evans, after seeing the collection, states that the signs not only are identical with those of the Cretan linear script¹ (and of the type B) but also occur in similar groups,¹ from which he infers that they must have been written by men of the same speech. To the question of their significance for the linguistic problem we shall recur later.

The much-discussed pre-Greek inscription of Lemnos, *IG* xii. 8. 1 (with full bibliography), is written in an alphabet identical with the Phrygian, and in a language which shows notable, and to most scholars convincing, indications of relationship with Etruscan.² This is in line with the tradition that Lemnos was once occupied by the *Τυρρηνοί* (Thuc. iv. 109 and later writers; also Hdt. vi. 140, with substitution

¹ But some of the signs cannot, so far as I see, be identified with any of those listed by Evans or Sundwall under either A or B. So at least one of the signs found at Mycenae is unknown in Crete (cf. Sundwall, *op. cit.*, p. 63). A group of three signs recurring on three of the Theban vases I do not find among the Cretan groups listed. But any detailed discussion of these vases must properly await their publication by the discoverer.

² The illogical statement of Ridgeway, *Early Age in Greece*, p. 146, "But this supposed Etruscan connection rests on no solid basis, for Kirchhoff has demonstrated that the alphabet of the Lemnian inscription is Phrygian," with a reference to Kirchhoff's *Studien*, pp. 54 ff., is perhaps the source of the curious lapse in Hall, *Oldest Civilization of Greece*, p. 174, "But the famous 'Etruscan' inscription of Lemnos is not Etruscan at all," with a reference to the same passage in Kirchhoff, where of course it is the alphabet only that is under discussion. In his *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 336, Hall has retracted his skepticism and says, "The famous inscription of Lemnos is now generally considered to be Etruscan." This is a bit strong in the other direction, and I prefer the statement given above in the text.

The widely different results obtained by those who attempted the interpretation invited the comment that the main resemblance between the language of the inscription and Etruscan was the fact that neither was understood. One of the best Etruscan scholars, Danielsson, was for a time skeptical of the evidence of relationship, though admitting it as a possibility and perhaps a quite probable one (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1906, pp. 597-98), and eventually accepting the "quasi-Etruscan" or "Tyrrhenian" character of the Lemnian (*Monde Oriental*, II, 237). While the detailed interpretation of the Lemnian as of most Etruscan inscriptions is wholly uncertain, the indications of relationship are vastly stronger than is usually the case when relationship is assumed under such unfavorable conditions of proof. They are convincingly summarized by Skutsch, Pauly-Wissowa, VI, 782 ff. Cf. also Herbig, *Orient. Literaturzeitung*, 1921, p. 319, and Latte versus Pareti, *Riv. di filol.*, Vols. XLVII, XLVIII.

The most accurate reading is that given by Nachmanson, *AM*, XXXIII, 47 ff. I have examined the original, now in the National Museum at Athens, and have nothing more important to add than that the interpunct after *holaiez* in A is reasonably certain. The first publication of the text contained several errors, especially in false interpuncts.

of the Pelasgian name). These were not of the Italian *Τυρσηνοί*, the Etruscans, but of those who remained in the Aegean region, the pirates of *h. Hom.* vii. 8 (cf. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, I, 175 ff., and Körte, Pauly-Wissowa, VI, 732). From a much earlier time they are probably to be recognized in the *Tursha* mentioned with the *Luka* or Lycians and other sea-peoples in Egyptian records of the thirteenth century B.C.

The tradition of the Lydian origin of the Etruscans (Hdt. i. 94) has, it is increasingly evident, some historical basis, if only we substitute Southwestern Asia Minor for the too specific Lydia. It is supported by the Anatolian affinities of Etruscan art and religion and by other probable cultural relations (cf. Körte, *op. cit.*, pp. 739 ff.), and linguistically by the comparison of Etruscan proper names with those of Asia Minor. The most important study of this latter evidence is that of Herbig, "Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen," *Ber. Bayr. Akad.*, 1914. The comparisons, first of suffixes then of stems, are not all of equal value, as has been pointed out by reviewers and recognized by the author himself. But the total impression is that the resemblances are too great to be accidental (see also below, pp. 10-12).

The Lydian inscriptions, now at last published in full,¹ show some points of resemblance to Etruscan structure, of which the most striking is the *l*-element in case forms and possessives.² Furthermore, one feature which pertains to the alphabet rather than the language is beyond all question noteworthy, namely the identity in both form and value of the Etruscan and Lydian *8=f*.³ For it is difficult to believe this accidental, and the natural conclusion is that an alphabet

¹ W. H. Buckler, "Lydian Inscriptions," *Sardis*, Vol. VI, Part ii, 1924.

² With the Etr. genitives in *-l*, as *Arñθal*, "son of Arñth"; *Larθal*, "son of Larth"; etc., cf. the Lyd. possessives in *-lis* and *-lid*, as *vānaš Manelis*, "tomb of Manes"; *akad Manelid*, "property of Manes"; and the case forms in *-l*, which have genitive, dative, and accusative function, e.g. *Alīksāntrul*, "of Alexander"; *Artimul* = *Ἀρτέμυδι*, *vānal*, "tomb" (object of a verb). Cf. also the "Hittite" pronominal genitives or possessives *ammēl*, "my"; *anzēl*, "our"; *abēl*, "his"; *kuēl*, "whose"; etc., and the Proto-Hittite *l*-forms in attributive relation (Forrer, *ZDMG*, LXXVI, 206, 231). Lydian has also a genitive in *-ls*, *Artakšassalēs*, *Mitridastalēs*, which recalls the Etruscan combination of *l*- and *s*-genitive in *Arñθalisa*, *Larθalisa*, and the genetivus genetivi *Arñθialisla*, *Velθurūsla*.

Cf. also the enclitic "and," Etr. *-c*, Lyd. *-k*. Many of the comparisons made by Littmann (*Sardis*, VI, i, 81) are of doubtful significance. No agreement in vocabulary has yet been established from words of known meaning.

³ Littmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff., has shown by a comparison of the Lydian and other forms of the name Sardis that the *8* must have had the value of a labial spirant.

containing this letter was brought from Asia Minor by the Etruscan invaders. This conclusion is contested by many scholars, but, I believe, on insufficient grounds.¹

The geographical names of the Greek mainland and the Aegean islands comprise a considerable number which, there is reason to believe, are of pre-Greek origin and in large part of Anatolian affinities. This is best established for the $\nu\theta$ - and $\sigma\sigma$ -names.² Names like

¹ The identity of the Lydian θ with the Etruscan was discussed by Kretschmer, *Denkschr. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. LIII (1908), before the Lydian value had been determined. What Kretschmer weighed as a possibility became, after the Lydian value was known, a strong probability, as urged by Danielsson, *Skrifter Vet. Samf. Uppsala*, XX (1917), 2, 38, namely that the Etruscan θ is a relic of a system of writing which the Etruscans brought with them from Asia Minor or received from their home during the period of colonization. The last part of Danielsson's statement was a needless concession to a possible chronological objection. For, while opinions differed as to the date of the Etruscan immigration and of the earliest Etruscan monuments, most archaeologists now believe that Montelius' dating (eleventh century for the immigration) is much too early. The earliest fixed date is furnished by an Egyptian vase found in an Etruscan tomb and inscribed with the name of a Pharaoh of 734-728 B.C., and the earliest tombs are thought to be not much earlier than 800 B.C. Cf. Karo, *AM*, XLV (1920), 106 ff. For the ninth century no chronological difficulty is involved in assuming that a modified type of the Greek alphabet was brought from Asia Minor.

Danielsson's view has been sharply criticized by other scholars, who insist that θ is a secondary letter in the Etruscan alphabet. So Hammerström, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des etrusk., lat. und griech. Alphabets* (1902), pp. 4 ff., who suggests the possibility that the Etruscans became acquainted with the θ through Phocaean or Lydian captives after the naval battle of Corsica in 534 B.C., but prefers the old derivation of θ from the θ of $\Phi\theta$. The first alternative is fanciful, while the second amounts to saying that the identity of the Lydian and Etruscan is accidental. Danielsson has replied to the criticisms and maintained his own view in a letter quoted by Hammarström (*op. cit.*, p. 6). Herbig, *Orient. Literaturzeitung*, 1921, p. 318, now accepts Danielsson's view. Sommer, *IF*, XLII, 92, regards θ as a secondary letter in Etruscan, yet does not believe its identity with the Lydian θ can be accidental. One may call it a secondary letter in the sense that it was supplementary to the West Greek alphabet which was the main basis of the historical Etruscan alphabet, and so, in the abcdaria which include it, was added at the end, and further that it was not the exclusive designation of f at all times and in all parts of Etruria. But there is no proof that it is secondary in a chronological sense. Instead of being a new creation, it may have been added from an older system of writing, as Danielsson has argued.

² Material in Pauli, *Altital. Forsch.*, II, 44 ff., critically sifted and discussed in Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, 293 ff., 402 ff. Fick's *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen* is of broader scope and, while including much that is doubtful, is suggestive and important. But the attempt to assign names specifically to the Carians, Leleges, Lycians, etc., is premature and is better ignored. Cf. also Kannengiesser, "Ägäische besonders kretische Namen bei den Etruskern," *Klio* XI, 26 ff., with Kretschmer's review, *Glotta*, IV, 313 ff. The Asia Minor nd - and ss -names are now considerably augmented by the new Hittite material, e.g. Arlanda, Puranda, Wyanawanda, Biassas, Nenassa, Daddassis, etc.

Arkwright *JHS*, XXXVIII (1918), 45 ff., criticizes the current view on the ground that there is no complete formal identity with the suffixes in Asia Minor (on this, see

Τίρυνς, -νθος, Κόρινθος, Ἐρύμανθος, Προβάλινθος, Κήρινθος, Πύρανθος, etc., resemble the *nd*-names of Asia Minor, like Ἄλινδα, Πίγινδα, Ὀγονδα, etc. in Caria (where the examples are most numerous), Κάλανδα, Σίλανδος in Lydia, Θρίανδα, Καδύανδα in Lycia, Ἴσυνδα, Τύμανδος in Pisidia, Ἀσπενδος in Pamphylia, etc.¹ The *σσ*- (Att. *ττ*-) and *σ*- names like Παρνασσός, Ὑμηττός, Γαργηττός, Κηφισός, Ἰαλυσός, Κνωσός, Πραισός, etc., are compared with Car. Ἀλικαρνασσός, Τελμησσός, Μυκαλησσός, Ἴασος, Lyd. Θυεσσός, Ταμασός, and other such, of which more than a hundred are quotable from Asia Minor.² Still further comparisons, of varying degrees of probability, are based upon other resemblances in suffix, or in the radical element, or upon identity of the whole name, as Ἄρνη, Λάρισα, etc.

below) and that *νθ*- and *σσ*-names occur in other regions. But it is not maintained that all such names are necessarily non-Greek or non-Indo-European. The strength of the argument lies in the great frequency of the *nd*- and *ss*-names in Asia Minor. Arkwright's real objection is not so much to the equations as to the conclusion that a single non-Indo-European language was once spoken in Greece and Asia Minor. This is an exaggeration of the conclusion reached by Kretschmer, which was, however, that the languages of Asia Minor, apart from the intrusive Thracio-Phrygian elements in the northwest, represented a single non-Indo-European linguistic group, a *kleinasiatische* or, to use the most convenient English term, Anatolian family. Against this too Arkwright's objections might apply. It is certainly true that the discoveries since the date of the *Einleitung* indicate a more complex linguistic situation in Asia Minor than was then suspected. The Hittite inscriptions of Boghas Keui have disclosed a bewildering variety of languages, of which the one in which the great mass of the texts is written, the state language, is mainly Indo-European in its inflectional system and non-Indo-European in its vocabulary, while what is regarded as the true Hittite, or "Proto-Hittite," is of totally different structure. The Lydian inscriptions have not brought any clear evidence of genetic relationship with the Lycian, and it is moreover believed that the Lycians are relatively late-comers in Asia Minor. The linguistic features which Kretschmer showed were so widespread in Asia Minor may rest on geographical continuity rather than on genetic relationship. With this understanding, however, it is still permissible to speak of Anatolian peculiarities and of Anatolian affinities of the pre-Greek forms. This is safer than the specific "Carian," which is suggested by the Greek tradition of earlier Carians in the Aegean islands and parts of the Greek mainland, and has some vogue among archaeologists. At the same time, it is not unlikely that Caria was the real center of the type in question.

¹ The *nd* represents an earlier *nt*, by a change which is well attested for Asia Minor (the native Lycian writing has the historical spelling *nt*) and was extended to the Greek dialect of Pamphylia (πίνδε = *πίντε*). The dental of this earlier *nt* differed in some respect from the Greek *τ*, perhaps was slightly aspirated, and was represented in Greek by θ. Cf. Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, p. 294; Jacobsohn, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1914, p. 981; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIV, 103.

² The *σσ*- and *σ*-forms are grouped together for convenience, without its being clear whether they reflect merely a difference in the representation of a foreign sound or two different types. According to Arkwright, *JHS*, XXXVIII, 53, the *σσ* is proper for the Carian but not for the Lycian names.

Pre-Greek origin is also indicated by the interchange between the different orders of stops, as in the Arcadian Γόρτυς, as the name appears in literature, beside Κόρτυς, Κορτύνιοι in Hesychius and on coins, Κορτύνιοι in an early fifth-century dedication at Delphi (Ditt. Syll.³ 49; cf. also IG v. 2. 441), and the modern Καρύταινα; likewise the Cretan Γόρτυς beside the personal name Κόρθους; the Arcadian and Cretan name has been plausibly compared with the Etruscan Cortona, beside which there is a gentile name *curthute* with the well-known Etruscan interchange of stops. Cf. also Πίθυμνα beside Πίτυμνα, compared with Etr. *ritumenas*, Καῦδος beside Γαῦδος (perhaps Etr. *cautias*, *cauthial*, Lat. *Cautius*, *Caudius*), Πραῖσος but φραισοι in an "Eteocretan" inscription.

Like many features of the religious cult, many of the names of the gods are no doubt of pre-Greek origin.¹ There are plenty of obviously Greek personifications, as Ἑστία, Ἥλιος, Σελήνη, Ἔρως, Νίκη, etc. But of the principal gods (apart from Ἑστία) only Ζεὺς bears a name of indisputably Greek and Indo-European origin. Δημήτηρ is a Greek compound, though the first element (δᾶ-, which Kretschmer² sees also in the second part of Ποσειδῶν, Ποτει-δᾶφον-) is probably of pre-Greek origin. Διόνυσος is Thracian.³ The cult of Ἥφαιστος is of Anatolian origin, and so presumably the name.⁴ Ἀθήνη is now generally regarded as of pre-Greek origin.⁵ For other names Greek etymologies have been proposed that are possible and in some cases attractive, yet by no means conclusive. Thus the cult of Ἀφροδίτη is mainly of oriental origin and so very likely the name, though it may also be plausibly explained as a Greek epithet.⁶ Ἐρμῆς⁷ and Ποσειδῶν⁸ may well be Greek, while Ἄρτεμις⁹ and Ἀπόλλων⁹ are

¹ Cf. the handbooks of recent date, e.g. Farnell, *Outline History of Greek Religion*, pp. 24 ff.; *Cambridge Anc. Hist.*, II, 612 ff.; also Kalinka, "Herkunft der griech. Götter," *Neue Jahrbücher*, XLV (1920), 401 ff.

² *Glotta*, I, 27 ff. ³ Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, p. 241; *Aus der Anomia*, p. 27.

⁴ Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrbücher*, XXXVII, 549 ff.

⁵ Wide, *AM*, XXVI, 251; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XI, 282; Wilamowitz, *Ber. Berl. Akad.*, 1921, 950 ff.

⁶ Kretschmer, *KZ*, XXXIII, 267; *Glotta*, V, 306.

⁷ Nilsson, *Griech. Feste*, pp. 388 ff., otherwise Kalinka, *op. cit.*, p. 409.

⁸ Kalinka, *op. cit.*, p. 411.

⁹ Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, XXXVIII, 575; Nilsson, *Griech. Feste*, p. 102; Kalinka, *op. cit.*, p. 410; otherwise Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 26; Bethe, *Festschrift Wackernagel*, pp. 14 ff.; Kretschmer, *Glotta*, XIII, 242.

generally regarded as pre-Greek, mainly on grounds other than linguistic.

Apart from the proper names, the Greek vocabulary contains many words of alien origin.¹ Some are loanwords of the historical period. But it would be remarkable if the Greeks had not taken over some words from the speech of their predecessors in the Aegean lands. Yet with our almost complete ignorance of pre-Greek appellatives of which both form and meaning are known, it is not to be expected that this should be demonstrated by specific identifications. Furthermore, the lack of a satisfactory Indo-European etymology for any given word is by no means proof that it is not of Indo-European origin, it merely places that word among those open to suspicion. Accordingly there is here a wide field for speculation, and the discussions of the subject inevitably contain much that is interesting and suggestive without being conclusive. With all reservations however, a considerable number of words may be assigned with great probability to a pre-Greek origin. Certain names of articles of commerce and terms employed in commerce, like *χιτών*, *κάδος*, *ἄρραβών*, were no doubt introduced by Phoenician traders. But in some cases the correspondence of Phoenician and Greek (and in part Latin) forms probably rests on derivation from a common Aegean source, e.g. *οἶνος*, etc. A common source, not Indo-European, is required to explain the relations of certain Greek and Latin forms, as *λίτρα* and *libra*, *μόλυβδος* and *plumbum*. As in the case of the place-names in *-νθος*, so many (not all) of the appellatives in *-νθος* are of pre-Greek origin, notably *λαβύρινθος* (originally the Cretan shrine of a deity corresponding to the Carian *Λάβρανδος*, this name connected with Lydian *λάβρυς*, "ax"),² and plant names like *ὑάκινθος*, *κολόκυνθος* *ἄψινθος*, *ἐρέβινθος*, *τερέβινθος* beside *τέρμινθος*. Among other probable examples are various names of plants, animals, stones, metals, vases, and some titles (*τύραννος*, *βασιλεύς*, *ἄναξ*).

Some comparisons have been made with Etruscan words of known meaning, of which the most striking are *ὄπνιω*, "marry, take to wife,"

¹ Cf. Meillet, *MSL*, XV, 161 ff., and *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, pp. 35 ff.; Cuny, *Rev. et. anc.*, XII, 154 ff.; Huber, "De lingua antiquissimorum Graeciae incolarum," *Commentationes Aenipontanae*, Vol. IX; with criticism of Hermann, *Glotta*, XIII, 150 ff., and Kretschmer, *ibid.*, p. 242.

² Kretschmer, *Einführung*, pp. 304, 404.

with Etr. *puia*, "wife,"¹ and *Τττηνία*, "*Τετράπολις*" (Steph. Byz.), with Etr. *huθ*, "four."²

Having reviewed the evidence of pre-Greek speech and noted its probable Anatolian affinities, we may turn now to the Greek language and the question of the date of its succession. By working forward from the prehistoric Indo-European parent-speech and backward from the historical period of Greek, one can determine roughly, on the one hand how early Greek may have been, on the other hand how early it must have been spoken in Greece.

The earliest unquestionably Indo-European forms of actual record occur in cuneiform writings from about 1400 B.C. on. They comprise a series of numeral compounds³ which are certainly Indic, the names of the kings of the Mitanni⁴ which are Aryan (Indo-Iranian) and perhaps more specifically Indic, the names of certain gods which have been identified with the names of Vedic deities,⁵ and further a considerable part of the inflectional system and a small part of the vocabulary of the official language of the Hittite state.⁶ We have here then forms which have already reached the Indo-Iranian or the Indic stage of development, or, in the case of the "Hittite," forms which are not of the Indo-Iranian branch but are on a very advanced stage of development.

¹ Hammarström, *Glotta*, XI, 212.

² Oštirs, cf. Kretschmer, *ibid.*, p. 277; XIII, 115.

³ Borrowed technical terms occurring in a work on horse-training written in "Hittite," namely *aikavartanna*, "a single turn" (of the stadium); *tieravartanna*, "a triple turn," similarly *panzavartanna*, *sallavartanna*, *nāvavartanna*, with the numerals for five, seven, and nine. In most cases these words are followed by a translation in which the numerals are expressed by the cuneiform signs. For the full context, cf. now Forrer, *ZDMG*, LXXVI (1922), 254 ff.

⁴ The much-discussed *Artalama*, *Shularna*, *Tushratta* etc., of the Tel-el-Amarna and Boghas Keui tablets. Cf. M. Bloomfield, *Amer. J. Ph.*, XXV, 8 ff.; E. Meyer, *KZ*, XLII, 19 ff.; Clark, *Amer. J. Theol.*, XXXIII, 261 ff.

⁵ Those identified by Winckler with Mitra, Varuna, Indra, and the Nāsatyas. Cf. now Luckenbill, *AJSL*, XXXVII, 171, 175; Forrer, *ZDMG*, LXXVI, 250.

⁶ This is not the true Hittite, the language which is expressly called Hittite when passages of it are introduced in the texts, and which it is now agreed to call Proto-Hittite. But it is permissible to use "Hittite" (with quotation marks to distinguish it) of what was after all the official language of the Hittite state, rather than the awkward Pseudo-Hittite or the uncertain Kanesian. For the present state of "Hittite" studies, cf. the accounts of Herbig in *Göt. Gel. Anz.*, 1921, pp. 193 ff.; *Idg. Jahrbuch*, VIII, 1 ff.; Forrer, *ZDMG*, LXXVI, 174 ff.; Sturtevant, *Class. Weekly*, 1925, pp. 171 ff.

A Babylonian chronicle of about 1926 B.C. records an invasion by the king of the Hittites. Whether the Indo-European element was already present in the language cannot be directly determined, for there are no texts in "Hittite" of this date. But there are indications that from about 2000 B.C. Asia Minor and Southwestern Asia were invaded by various horse-driving peoples of Indo-European and in part Indo-Iranian speech (cf. E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, I, 2, 651 ff.; *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 107, 311 ff., 552 ff.). The important rôle of the horse in the life of the Indo-Europeans is shown, not by the mere agreement in the word, but by its great frequency in the formation of personal names in Indo-Iranian, Greek (over 200 such), and Celtic. There is a Cappadocian representation of a four-horse team from ca. 2000 B.C., and the horse was introduced into Mesopotamia by the Kassites, into Egypt by the Hyksos. From ca. 1600 B.C. it is represented on Cretan and Mycenaean seals, etc.

It is utterly impossible to make any accurate estimate of the time requisite for the development from the parent-speech of the several Indo-European languages as they appear when they first emerge in recorded form, at various dates from about the middle of the second millennium B.C. on.¹ One may place the period of Indo-European unity at 3000 B.C. or as late as 2500 B.C. But it is safe to say that by 2000 B.C. the main branches of the family had been differentiated and acquired their special characteristics. By this time certainly there existed a language possessing those phonological, morphological, and lexical features which distinguish Greek as a whole, regardless of dialectic differences, from the other Indo-European languages, a language which, with anticipation of its eventual designation, we may call Greek. From this point of view, we must recognize the existence, somewhere, of a Greek-speaking people, that is of "Greeks," in 2000 B.C., and so the possibility, but only the possibility, that they had entered the Balkan regions or even Greece itself. On general grounds and in view of the movements in Asia, it is altogether probable that the Greeks too were on the march at that time and had entered the

¹ The change was vastly greater than that from Latin to the Romance languages as they emerge in the ninth century A.D. and later. But the comparison is without value, owing to the totally different conditions (absence of a complete geographical and cultural break, except in the case of Roumanian, and the existence of an established written language).

Balkan peninsula. Whether they were already in Greece can be determined, if at all, only by evidence from Greece itself.

In working back from the historical period, one properly starts from the records which have come down to us in their original form, the inscriptions. The earliest Greek inscriptions of determinate date, that is of date fixed by persons or events mentioned in the text, are from the beginning of the sixth century B.C. By comparison with these, other inscriptions that show more archaic forms of the alphabet are assigned to an earlier date—how much earlier is a matter of rough estimate. Epigraphists formerly maintained an ultra-conservative attitude under which many archaeologists have grown restive.¹ Kirchhoff, whose lead was followed by others, never ventured to suggest for any known inscription an earlier date than the second half of the seventh century.² On the other hand, Hiller von Gärtringen, *Thera*, II, 253, believes that the Theran inscriptions of the first period date from the eighth century or earlier. This is altogether probable, and there is also no reason why we need hesitate to ascribe the inscription on the dipylon vase³ to the eighth century.

The interrelations of the local alphabets show that the latter were already established in Greece in the period of the great western colonization, in the eighth century. The Corinthian alphabet was carried to Coreyra, the Chalcidian to Italy, etc. It is quite otherwise for the very much earlier period of eastern colonization. There are no such relationships between the alphabets of the Asia Minor coast and the Aegean isles and those of the mainland regions from which the colonization started. The distribution of alphabets has no relation to the distribution of dialects, which does reflect the earlier conditions.

¹ Thus Froehner, *Mon. Piot*, II, 142, a propos of a very archaic inscribed bronze figure from Boeotia: "Puis l'alphabet grec est-il vraiment si jeune qu'il nous interdit de chercher aucun document avant le VII^e siècle?"

² So *Studien*, p. 64, of the earliest Theran then known; while of the earliest Attic inscription, on the dipylon vase, he merely says, *IG I*, Suppl., p. 11: "initii saeculi a Chr. sexti haud dubie antiquior."

³ Barring a few insignificant fragments, this has stood as a unique example of an inscribed geometric vase, and as the inscription was scratched on after manufacture there has been some suspicion that it was not of the same date as the vase. The excavations carried on by the American School at a shrine on Hymettus have brought to light a considerable number of important fragments of inscribed geometric pottery, which will be published by Dr. Blegen.

The adoption of a native syllabary by the Greeks of Cyprus is striking evidence that the Greek alphabet was unknown when they left the Peloponnesus—if any such evidence were needed for a period which on other grounds must be set back beyond the most extravagant claims for the antiquity of the Greek alphabet.

If we reason from the known existence of local alphabets in the eighth century at least, and take into account the time requisite for their evolution (though some of the variations merely reflect those of the Phoenician), also the fact that the earliest writings were presumably on perishable material, such as merchants' accounts on papyrus,¹ and further recall that the Phoenician activity in mercantile marine began in the twelfth century, after the fall of the Egyptian Empire,² and reached its height in the next few centuries, one may take the tenth century as a reasonable and conservative estimate of the date of the introduction and adaptation of the Phoenician alphabet.³ In any case the history of the alphabet does not definitely take us back into the second millennium B.C.

For this we must turn to the interrelations of the dialects. Their importance as evidence of the earlier grouping of the Greek peoples is recognized by all historians, but not always with full understanding or acceptance of the conclusions reached by students of the dialects,

¹ Phoenician writing was a continuation of the brush-pen and papyrus-roll tradition, in contrast to the stylus and tablet tradition. Cf. Breasted, *AJSL*, XXXII, 230 ff.

² Cf. Breasted, *Ancient Times*, p. 266.

³ The earliest Greek letter forms are in some respects nearer to those of the "Moabite stone" (890 B.C.) than to those of the thirteenth-century inscription from Byblus, published by Dussaud, *Syria*, V (1924), 135 ff., and now by Torrey, *JAOS*, XLV (1925), 269 ff. From the forms of the aleph in this and in a tenth-century inscription (but cf. Torrey's caution, p. 275) Dussaud concludes that the Greek adoption must have been later than the third quarter of the tenth century.

Another angle of the matter is suggested by the difference in the forms of the kaph. That of the Moabite stone (כ) is clearly the source of the Greek kappa, yet it also resembles a ψ. This gives some support to the view that the Greek psi was in origin a variant of the kappa, and there are other reasons for believing that its value of χ is earlier than that of ψ. Now the kaph form of the Byblus inscriptions is כ, identical with the earliest form of the psi in many Greek alphabets and with the regular guttural sign of the Lycian alphabet. It is quite possible that the Phoenician alphabet reached the coast of Asia Minor at an earlier date than that of its adoption in Crete, Thera, etc., and that by this route its earlier form made some contribution to the fuller Greek alphabet. But the whole question of the dissemination of the alphabet is still an outstanding one, which cannot be discussed at length here.

among whom there is substantial agreement in grouping, with some differences in terminology.¹

Agreement between dialects in certain features, if not accidental (as it may be for one or another particular phenomenon), must be due to their contiguity at some period. It may reflect their position in the historical period, in which case we learn nothing new, or their position in one or more prehistoric periods, which is what concerns us here. For example, the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus have so many distinctive features in common that no one could think this accidental, and since this agreement obviously cannot be explained

¹ Among recent historians, Beloch is in important respects at variance with the views of all dialect students, a fact which should be made clear to those who may give undue weight to his emphatic statements. He proclaims the importance of the dialect evidence, but is loath to admit its significance if it supports the despised tradition. Thus, *Gr. Gesch.*, I, 2, 88 ff., after rating the tradition as wholly worthless and the comparison of cults and local names as nearly so, he concludes, "So bleiben als einzige wirklich zuverlässige Quelle die Dialekte." Then, after some reservations, "Immerhin kann die Dialektforschung hier der Geschichte ganz hervorragende Dienste leisten. Dafür ist freilich unumgängliche Voraussetzung, dass sie sich auf ihr eigenes Gebiet beschränkt und nicht etwa die sagenhafte Ueberlieferung hineinzieht, wie das leider in der Regel geschieht. Ein jeder kehre vor seiner Tür." He adds that what we need are maps displaying the distribution of each important phonetic phenomenon, and mentions, as in a measure furnishing a substitute for such, the tables in my "Interrelations of the Greek Dialects," *CP*, II, 241 ff., which he calls the best survey of the peculiarities of the Greek dialects that has come to his attention.

Now it is a truism that the first step in dialect study is to determine the distribution of each linguistic (not merely phonetic) phenomenon. This has been done in various special studies, and in my *Greek Dialects* I have given especial attention to statements covering this, though newly added material compels constant revision in some detail. But one must protest against the notion that the sole function of the dialect student is to present this raw material to the historian and that he must himself abstain from the next step, the synthesis, the interpretation of the material in terms of larger groups. May not those who have a first-hand knowledge of the linguistic facts be credited also with some especial competence to estimate their relative significance, and, again, after having objectively reached certain conclusions as to the character and relationships of the several dialects, are they debarred from considering how far these link up with the tales of migration? Is the historical and critical method so foreign to linguistic study?

Having formerly dismissed the Doric migration as a myth, Beloch now admits that the historical inhabitants of Argolis and Laconia were immigrants from Central Greece who supplanted a population related to the Arcadian. "Soweit also wird die Sage von der dorischen Wanderung durch die Dialekte bestätigt." But for him it was rather an Achaean invasion, the Achaeans were a first wave of Dorians who occupied Argolis long before another wave, this time with the Doric name, occupied Laconia; the current use of "Achaean" for the pre-Doric peoples or dialects is a *Geschichtsfälschung*. What is this novel theory, according to which the Argolic Achaeans of Agamemnon were Doric speaking, built on? On the fact that the two regions which bore the name Achaea in the historical period were, he says, Doric speaking. It is true that the dialect of the Peloponnesian Achaea is West Greek as far back as we can trace it and probably had

by their historical position it proves that Cyprus was colonized, not necessarily or probably from inland Arcadia, but from a part of the Peloponnesus the speech of which was at the time akin to the historical Arcadian. Again, the Northwest Greek dialects (Phocian, Locrian, etc.), while having some features of their own, share in the general characteristics of the Doric dialects, so that their close relationship to Doric is beyond question. They are even called Doric by some, or more specifically North Doric. But it is preferable not to tamper with the historical application of the Doric name and to employ West

been since the Doric invasion. But why must the name of the country be ascribed to the invaders and not be a survival from the pre-invasion period, as has been generally assumed? Why it stuck in this particular region, among all those that might have been called Achaeae, we do not know, by any theory. As for Achaea Phthiotis, all the inscriptions of any extent are late, mostly of the third or second century B.C., and in the Northwest Greek *κοινή*. This has been attributed to the influence of the Aetolian league, and there is nothing absurd in this view, as Beloch claims, when one bears in mind the frequent use of this *κοινή* at Delphi in place of the true Delphian, or, to take a case where the native dialect was not already of the West Greek type, the use of a Doric *κοινή*, due to the influence of the Achaeae league, in late Arcadian inscriptions. Still, it is not unlikely that even before the Aetolian domination in Phthiotis the West Greek element was stronger here than farther north, just as it was stronger in Thessaliotis than in Pelasgiotis. The valley of the Spercheus, which was a part of the Homeric Phthia and the home of Achilles, was occupied in the historical period by Malians and Aenianes of West Greek speech, yet no one doubts that they were intruders. Cf. Allen, *Homeric Catalogue of Ships*, pp. 110 ff.

But now several Thessalian forms have come to light in short inscriptions from Phthiotis (*IG* ix. 2. 97, 141, 199, 208), which, in spite of Beloch's effort to minimize their effect, support the current view that within the historical period the dialect of Phthiotis was Thessalian and to that extent Aeolic. In this matter Beloch's view (and that of Chadwick, *Heroic Age*, pp. 280 ff.) is opposed to that of virtually all special students of the dialects. Cf. Kern, *Neue Jhrb.*, XIII (1904), 16 ff.; Thumb, *Handbuch der griech. Dialekte*, § 213; Buck, *Greek Dialects*, § 214; Bechtel, *Griech. Dialekte*, I, 133; Cauer, *Grundfragen*³, p. 271; Schwyzler, *Rh. Mus.*, LXXII, 430.

The term Achaeae has been given such varied applications that there is something to be said for abandoning its use except as a harmless equivalent of Homeric Greeks. But for most scholars, who have no doubt that the Homeric Greeks were pre-Dorian, it is Beloch's use of the term which is of all the most perverse.

Beloch also refuses to recognize or give due weight to the obvious mixture of West Greek and Aeolic characteristics in Thessalian and Boeotian and its relation to the statement of Herodotus (vii. 176) that the Thessalians were West Greek invaders of a land formerly Aeolic and the statement of Thucydides (i. 12) that the Boeotians were invaders driven south by the Thessalians. For Thessaly the tradition is in complete accord with the linguistic evidence. For Boeotia there is a confusion of traditions (cf. Allen, *Hom. Cat.*, pp. 42 ff.) and the added complication of Boeotians in Homer. But no matter to which stratum the name Boeotian properly belonged, there is no reasonable doubt that here too there was a West Greek invasion of a land once Aeolic in speech.

For a more exhaustive criticism of Beloch's attitude in all such matters, cf. Nilsson, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1914, pp. 526 ff.

Greek as the comprehensive term to include the Northwest Greek dialects and the Doric proper. Yet for the sake of brevity one may speak of pre-Doric Greece, meaning Greece prior to the West Greek expansion.

These facts, the close relation of Doric to Northwest Greek and of Cyprian to Arcadian, and the radical difference between the two groups, point unmistakably to a situation to explain which, even if there were no tradition of a Doric invasion, such a movement would have to be assumed.

The relation between the Aeolic, Ionic, and Doric dialects in Asia Minor and those of the mainland is clear. It is the juxtaposition of these three dialects here, coupled with their importance in literature, that is the source of the traditional classification of the Greek dialects, a classification which either ignored the Northwest Greek and Arcadian-Cyprian groups, or in the case of Strabo led to an unwarranted extension of Aeolic to include everything not Ionic or Doric.¹

The relation of Ionic to Attic and of the Doric to that of the mainland requires no comment. The dialect of Lesbos and the adjacent coast region finds its closest relative in Thessalian and next to that in Boeotian. Both Thessalian and Boeotian contain a series of distinctively Aeolic characteristics, but also share in several of the West Greek characteristics. The latter element is stronger in Boeotia than in Thessaly, and within Thessaly is stronger in Thessalotis than in Pelasgiotis. This mixture of Aeolic and West Greek points to a West Greek invasion of lands once Aeolic, which is also indicated by tradition (cf. p. 17, footnote). There is at least one Aeolic characteristic in Phocian, and even for southwestern Aetolia the inference from Thucydides iii. 102 that Calydon and Pleuron were once Aeolic, taken in connection with their inclusion in the "Catalogue of Ships," their rôle in legend, and the existence of Mycenaean remains there, may well be correct. In this case, certain apparently Aeolic features of the dialect of Elis may be explained by assuming that the West Greek-speaking

¹ This loose conception of Aeolic still colors in a literal sense the Kiepert and other maps of ancient Greece. In my *Greek Dialects* I have given a map colored in accordance with present views. Beloch's map, *Gr. Gesch.*, I, 2, end, differs from mine in not showing the mixture in Thessalian and Boeotian; in not distinguishing the Doric and the Northwest Greek dialects, as the latter term is commonly understood; and in designating as Northwest Greek a territory farther north, most of which is beyond the range of the dialects sufficiently known to us to be included in any classification.

Aetolian invaders had retained some elements of an earlier Aeolic Aetolian. A different suggestion (Bechtel, *Gr. Dial.*, II, 841, 849) is that the pre-invasion dialect of Elis was Aeolic, but it is more probable that this was nearer akin to Arcadian. Here however one is getting beyond solid ground.

The dialect of Pamphylia shows West Greek characteristics together with others which belong to the Arcadian-Cyprian group, indicating that the earliest colonists were pre-Doric Peloponnesians akin to those who colonized Cyprus, but followed by Dorians.

The Doric invasion, or rather the West Greek expansion, in Northern Greece as well as to the Peloponnesus, is the great event that separates the historical period from the heroic age. No certain means of dating it are available. It can only be said that the traditional dates assigned to the Doric invasion (1104 B.C. by the system of chronology most commonly followed, 1148 by another, etc.) fall in a period which accords with the general probability and are accepted by most scholars as roughly correct.¹

In the Greece of the heroic age, the Greece portrayed in Homer, the "Catalogue of Ships" included,² the West Greeks, doubtless located in the remoter northwest regions, are wholly out of the picture.³ The rest of Northern Greece beyond Attica was Aeolic, and the eastern Aeolic movement had probably begun. Most of the Peloponnesus was occupied by people of speech belonging to the Arcadian-Cyprian group, which, if we would avoid the term Achaean in this connection (cf. p. 17, footnote), we may call simply Arcadian or, to distinguish this broader use, Arkadian. This Arkadian speech was carried to Cyprus where it remained dominant, to Pamphylia where it remained an important constituent of the later dialect, and to Rhodes, Crete, Thera, etc., where some scattered traces of it survived in the later Doric. Speech of the Attic-Ionic group, or Ionic for short, embraced Attica

¹ Otherwise Beloch, who puts the Doric occupation of Laconia at about 1000 B.C. (I, 142), but his Doric-Achaean conquest of Argolis in the seventeenth century or earlier (I, 2, 96)!

² Allen, *Hom. Cat.*, has shown convincingly that the "Catalogue" is an important geographical survey of pre-Doric Greece.

³ If ever the assumption of an interpolation was justified both by general probability and by the context, it is for the passage mentioning Dorians in Crete, as first pointed out by Beloch, *Ausonia*, IV, 220; *Gr. Gesch.*, I, 2, 47; cf. Evans, *Palace of Minos*, I, 11.

with Euboea and presumably at least the nearer Cyclades (the period of the main eastern Ionic colonization is doubtful), also, doubtless, Megara and a portion of northeastern Peloponnesus. At a still earlier period it may have covered much more of mainland Greece (cf. below, pp. 23 ff.), but for the period now under discussion the Ionic group was of inferior importance to the other two.

In Homer the Ionic element is insignificant in the story, though dominant in its final composition. The chief heroes on the Greek side were from regions of Aeolic or Arkadian speech, and again the Aeolic element in the Homeric language is a clear vestige of earlier Aeolic lays.¹

It is from this period of pre-Doric Greece that we have the earliest references to Greeks in outside sources. The Semitic name for the Greeks, derived from the earlier form of the Ionian name (**Iāfores*), does not carry us beyond the first millennium B.C. But the identification with the Achaeans of the Akaiwasha mentioned among the sea-peoples, "Northerners coming from all lands," in Egyptian records of the reign of Merneptah (ca. 1225 B.C.),² has come to be pretty generally recognized and in view of the new evidence may be unreservedly accepted.

The new evidence is one of the many welcome surprises which the cuneiform tablets of Boghas Keui have yielded. The identification of the name *Alakshandu* with the Greek name *Ἀλέξανδρος* was first proposed by Luckenbill (*CP*, VI [1911], 85 ff.), a fact overlooked by Kretschmer (*Glotta*, XIII [1924], 205 ff.), who makes the identification anew, quoting further occurrences of the name in the form *Alakshandush*. This *Alakshandush* was a contemporary of the Hittite kings Mutallu and Hattushil III, who reigned before and after 1300 B.C., and he is called the king of Arzawa or one of the four kings of Arzawa, specifically of Wilush.

¹ The view of Allen, *Hom. Cat.*, p. 21, that Homer wrote "in his own language, the dialect spoken in Chios" is simply incredible. The Aeolic admixture in the dialect of Chios, as seen in the inscriptions, is limited to certain definite features. Such a mixture of dialects and periods in equivalent forms as we find in Homer could never have belonged to actual speech, and can only be explained as the result of literary evolution. Allen refers to the article of Giles, "Was Homer a Chian?" *Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc.* (1915). But Giles thinks of the poet's birth in a border region only as a contributory factor, in addition to the existence of earlier Aeolic lays. That is something quite different.

² Breasted, *Anc. Records*, III, 238; *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, II, 282; Hall, *Anc. Hist. Near East*, pp. 70, 376.

And now, according to the identifications proposed by Forrer in his preliminary report, *Mitt. d. deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft*, 1924, Number 63, we have from the reign of Dudhalia III (ca. 1260-1225 B.C.) frequent mention of an Atreus (*Attarissiyas*) king of Achaia (*Aḥḥiyawā*, cf. **Ἀχαΐοι*, whence Lat. *Achivī*), who made attacks on Caria and on Cyprus. In the annals of the same king there is a list of the lands of a hostile state called Assuwa, which Forrer places in Western Asia Minor, and the last of these is called *Ta-ru-i-sha*, which Forrer identifies with Troy (the formal relation is better explained by Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 213). In the annals of Murshil II (1337-1312 Forrer, 1355-1329 *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*) Eteocles (*Ta-wa-ga-la-va-as*, i.e. *Tawaglawas* = **Ἐτεφο-κλέφες*) is king of Achaia and is also called an Aeolian king (*A-ya-wa-la-as* = **Αἰφολός*). His father, according to Forrer's combinations, was Andreus (*An-ta-ra-wa-as* = **Ἀνδρεΐς*), who appears in a text from the first years of Murshil's reign as king of Achaia and Lesbos (*La-az-pa*).

From a study of the geography of the Hittite campaigns, Forrer locates these Greeks in Pamphylia. As ruler of Pamphylia Tawaglawas was a vassal of the Hittite king, but as king of Achaia he was a Great King, addressed as "brother" by Murshil. *Aḥḥiyawā* was Greece or the Aeolic part of Greece, and Tawaglawas and Antrawas were identical with *Ἐτεοκλῆς* and his father *Ἀνδρεΐς*, the first kings of Orchomenos (Paus. ix. 34. 5). And from the sequence of rulers, Andreus, Eteocles,—Atreus, the conclusion is drawn by Schuchardt (*AM*, XLVII, 123): "Das nördliche Griechenland ist zuerst der Schwerpunkt des neuen Reiches, ganz wie die Sagen und die Funde bezeugen. Dann verlegt er sich nach Argolis."

All this accords remarkably with legend and the archaeological evidence of early centers of civilization at Orchomenos as well as at Mycenae and Tiryns, and one can only hope that Forrer's promised full publication of the texts and discussion of the geographical problems will substantiate the results and resolve some apparent difficulties in his (and Schuchardt's) broad conclusions. For example, how comes it that rulers of a great empire centered in mainland Greece are continuously represented as personally present, as if in fact the resident dynasty, in what was only a distant colony?¹

¹ The difficulty of understanding this is lessened if the name Arzawa designates not Cilicia only but all Western Asia Minor, as urged on apparently good grounds by Götze, *Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit*.

At any rate, several, if not all, of the identifications of names as Greek names are altogether convincing, and we may accept now as a matter of record the existence of a Greek colony in Asia Minor as early as the fourteenth century B.C.; and from this, quite apart from the question of the personal identifications with legendary rulers, we must of course infer Greek dominance in mainland Greece. Furthermore, it is a probable inference from a passage in the Amarna letters and from Egyptian records that the Greek colonization of Cyprus began in the fourteenth century and was definitely established before the end of the thirteenth. With the accrued evidence of Greek expansion in this period it is altogether probable that it extended at about the same time to the later Doric islands, Rhodes, Crete, Thera, etc., and it may well be that the destruction of the palace at Cnossos at the end of Late Minoan II was the result of an Achaean invasion.

For the mainland in any case it is now established that at least the third Mycenaean period, or Late Helladic III, that of the Mycenae and Tiryns best known to us in the present ruins, was Greek. This accords with the previous opinion of most archaeologists, and refutes that of Sir Arthur Evans, who has constantly maintained that the Mycenaean civilization down to its last days was Cretan, not merely the result of that Cretan influence which all admit, but of actual Cretan "conquest and widespread settlement,"¹ and that the language of the Cretan writings "was actually spoken by the dominant population of mainland Greece down to the last days of the Mycenaean civilization."² For this last assertion he has in mind the specimens of Cretan writing in Greece, and especially the great collection of inscribed stirrup-jars found at Thebes (cf. above, pp. 5-6), which he has greeted as confirmation of his view. We accept provisionally his statement of the identity of groups as well as of the simple signs with the Cretan linear, and the inference that they represent the same speech. We must also admit that the size and conditions of the find preclude the possibility of the jars being imported from Crete and prove that they are products of a local pottery. But if the Cretan language were

¹ *Palace of Minos*, I, 23, 27.

² So in his letter to the *London Times* of April 8, 1924, when he had heard of and accepted the Atræus identification, but was not yet aware of the other evidence carrying us back to the fourteenth century.

that of the dominant population in Greece, we should certainly expect to find it more extensively employed in writing and not merely on vases but also in tablet records as in Crete. (The same argument, in addition to the special Cretan grouping of signs, would apply against any notion that the Greeks had learned the Cretan system of writing and that the language of these inscriptions is Greek.) And now that we know that the dominant population was Greek in the third Mycenaean period, to which these stirrup-jars belong, the simplest explanation is that there were families of Cretan potters, as no doubt other Cretan artists, in Thebes and elsewhere. At the most, we might consider the possibility in the case of Thebes, with its peculiar position in the legends of the heroic age, that it was an alien enclave in the midst of a population mainly Greek. It is well known that Dörpfeld believes there were several alien enclaves, Phoenician, Tyrrhenian, etc., in this period.

What now of the earlier Mycenaean periods, beginning with that of the shaft graves at Mycenae? Was this also Greek, and, if so, of the same branch of the Greeks? Do the Aeolic- and Arkadian-speaking Achaeans constitute the first Greek wave, with which a then less important Ionic wave was contemporaneous? Hitherto we have represented these three dialect groups as co-ordinate, for in fact the Arkadian group shows some notable points of agreement with the Ionic, more in Arcadian than in Cyprian, and again others with the Aeolic (cf. Charts I and Ia in my *Greek Dialects*). But the latter are the more numerous, and indicate for an earlier period a close relationship and territorial contiguity for the Aeolic and Arkadian speech, as against the Ionic.

What was the position of Ionic when the Arkadian branch was detached from the Aeolic? Kretschmer, *Glotta*, I, 9 ff., has developed the thesis that the Ionians (his identification of the Ionians with the Pelasgians does not materially affect the argument, and may be left out of account here) represent a first Greek wave, which covered not only the parts that remained Ionic in the historical period but also much of the territory that was later Aeolic and Arkadian (and still later in part Doric). There is little doubt that the entire shore of the Saronic gulf, the Argolic Acte included, was once Ionic, and the tradition that the northern coast of the Peloponnesus was once Ionic need

not be too lightly dismissed. There are many scattered statements, though they do not in themselves inspire much confidence, in which various Ionic colonies are derived from towns in all parts of Greece. This traditional evidence, such as it is, Kretschmer would support by consideration of the dialect relations, the features which Arcadian and in part Cyprian have in common with Ionic and which he explains as taken over from an earlier Ionic population, rather than as due to the influence of an adjacent contemporaneous Ionic population in a part of the Peloponnesus.

This theory of an earlier Ionic wave is by no means so firmly grounded or so generally accepted as the other conclusions from dialect and traditional evidence which have been stated above. But it is in many ways an attractive hypothesis, the application of which was briefly stated by Kretschmer and has been more fully worked out by Nilsson (*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1914, pp. 534 ff.). The latter draws a tentative picture according to which the Ionians, constituting the first Greek invasion, were dominant in the early Mycenaean period, raided Crete and brought back Cretan artisans, and were later succeeded by Achaeans, who were dominant in the third Mycenaean period. Nilsson also (pp. 523-26) points to certain features of the early Mycenaean civilization as derived from the north, namely the dress, the palace plan, beads of Baltic amber in the shaft graves, and the horse which is represented on gems and frescoes. The horse was admittedly introduced into the Mediterranean region by Indo-European peoples (cf. above, p. 13), and the only question is whether it first reached Greece with the Greek invaders from the north or via the Orient.

In any case, the now certain knowledge of Greek expansion in the Aegean in the early fourteenth century makes it altogether probable that the mainland had been Greek for a considerable time, and that the early Mycenaean period, whether Ionic or already Achaean, was also at least Greek, in other words that the whole Mycenaean or Late Helladic period, from about 1600 B.C. on, was Greek.

It is quite otherwise when we go back to the Middle Helladic period, ca. 2000-1600 B.C. Here we are beyond the reach of even an inference from actual records or from dialect relations. According to archaeologists the beginning of this period was marked by a distinct break, "the introduction of a new cultural strain," "a complete break

in the continuity of civilization."¹ The conclusion that there was also a break in racial continuity at this point has been favored, though recognized as uncertain (cf. Wace, *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, I, 607). It is adopted and given specific application in the recent article of Harland cited above (*Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil.*, XXXIV, 1 ff.), who places here his "Minyan Migration," the first of the Hellenic or Indo-European stock, and points out that the historians E. Meyer and Beloch have arrived at the same approximate date for the first Greek invasion.²

This hypothesis of Harland's is built up on the archaeological evidence of an invasion, yet in identifying this with an Indo-European invasion from the north it not only lacks direct support but meets an obstacle in the archaeological data. His view that the so-called Minyan ware was brought down from the north is opposed by the fact that this ware is found only sporadically in Thessaly and its distribution proves it that it came from the south (Wace and Thompson, *Prehistoric Thessaly*, pp. 186, 247). The ultimate source of Minyan ware is an outstanding question, but whatever outside connection there is with the East. Forsdyke (*JHS*, XXXIV, 126 ff.) regards it as introduced into Greece from Troy (p. 152), while Childe (*ibid.*, XXXV, 196 ff.) rejects its actual derivation from Troy, but admits a real connection with Trojan ware which he regards as due to a preceding period of close cultural relation between Greece, the Cyclades, and the Troad. The connection of matt-painted ware is with the Cyclades and not with the north. And in general, just as the cultural type of the Early Helladic period spread from south to north, stopping at the

¹ Wace and Blegen, *BSA*, XXII, 189; Blegen, *Korakou*, p. 124. The clearest indication of a break was furnished by the American excavations at Korakou and Zygouries, with their evidence of a conflagration, and also by the strata at Orchomenos. Yet at other points the transition from Early to Middle Helladic seems to have been gradual. Cf. Wace, *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, I, 606.

² Beloch's dating results from a combination of his Doric-Achaean theory (cf. above, pp. 16-17, footnote), which Harland accepts, and his chronology of the Achaean invasion, which Harland rejects. That is, Beloch argues (*Gr. Gesch.*, I, 1, 92) that the Achaean invasion must have occurred before the beginning of the Mycenaean period, in the seventeenth or eighteenth century, and that since the Achaeans found a Greek population in the Peloponnesus its first Greek occupation could not be later than about 2000 B.C. Both premises are unfounded.

E. Meyer's estimate (*Gesch. d. Alt.*, I, 1, 808) rests on general considerations pointing to the high antiquity of the first Greek invasion, of which all tradition was lost.

Othrys range (cf. Wace, *Cambr. Anc. Hist.*, I, 604-5), so that of the Middle Helladic period likewise extended only to Othrys, and there is nothing in the archaeological evidence which points to a northern connection. It is not asserted that this situation eliminates the possibility of an invasion by Indo-European Greeks whose material civilization was so inferior to that which they found in Greece that it was lost in the latter, leaving no trace of a northern connection. For it might be claimed that even in the later and certainly Greek period there is no conclusive archaeological evidence of northern relations (but cf. Nilsson, quoted above, p. 24). I merely point out that the theory of a *northern* invasion at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period finds no support in the archaeological data, and other evidence there is none.

If one seeks a working hypothesis, and more cannot be expected at present, the one which works best is that the population of the Middle Helladic period, as well as that of the Early Helladic, was of that group, of Anatolian affinities, which left its record in geographical names, etc. (see above, pp. 8 ff.). Whatever break there was between the Early and Middle Helladic may reflect cultural changes and local movements within this group, and possibly a more intensive intercourse with the East.

A general scheme, progressing from hypothesis to conclusions based upon positive evidence, would be:

- Neolithic Age. Population of wholly unknown racial and linguistic affinities, but presumably akin to that of the Danubian region.
- Early and Middle Helladic, ca. 2500-1600 B.C. "Aegean" population, of Anatolian affinities, whose language left traces in local names.
- Late Helladic, ca. 1600-1200 B.C. Greek. (Perhaps first Ionic, later) Aeolic-Arkadian element dominant. Greek expansion in the Aegean. Possibly non-Greek enclaves, by survival or intrusion or both.
- "Doric Invasion," ca. 1200-1100 B.C. West Greek expansion at expense of Aeolic and Arkadian elements. Dialect distribution as of the historical period. Introduction of the alphabet, ca. 1000-900 B.C. Western colonization, ca. 800 B.C. +

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THINGS WITHOUT HONOR

BY ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Among the numerous products of Greek and Roman rhetorical studies which have come down to us a prominent place is occupied by laudatory speeches, variously known in Greek as *ἐγκώμια* or *ἔπαινοι*, and in Latin as *laudes* or *laudationes*. In addition to those actually preserved we learn not a little about this type of composition from the ancient rhetorical theorists,¹ who show that panegyric laudations—together with their less frequent opposites, the speeches of blame (*ψόγοι*, *vituperationes*)²—might concern themselves not only with gods, heroes, rulers, or other persons, and with such dignified themes as countries,³ rivers,⁴ cities,⁵ or mountains, but also with professions, arts, abstract virtues, ages of life, and even with humbler topics, such as the lower animals, plants, or inanimate objects.⁶ Almost all subjects, then, living, inanimate, or abstract, were material for the panegyrist.⁷

¹ The theory and classification of encomia forms a large topic, discussed by many writers, a brief summary of which is given by Crusius in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, s.v. "Enkomion" (1905). There may be here noted Arist. *Rhet.* i. 3; i. 9; [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* iii. 19 Sp.; Auct. *ad Her.* iii. 9–15; Cic. *de Inv.* ii. 177–78; Sen. *Ep.* cii. 9 ff.; Quintil. iii. 7; Alex. *Rhet. περὶ ῥητορ. ἀφορμῶν*, pp. 2–4 Sp.; *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, ii. 1. 346 Sp.; Aristid. *Ars rhet.* i. 504–6 Sp.; Hermog. *Progygmn.* vii. 11–14 Sp.; Aphthon. *Progygmn.* viii. 35–36 Sp.; Nic. *Sophist. Progygmn.*, pp. 477–82 Sp.; Volkmann, *Hermagoras* (1865), p. 40; Volkmann-Hammer, *Rhet. d. Gr. u. Römer* (3d ed., 1901), pp. 33–35; Burgess, *Epicletic Literature* (1902), especially pp. 157–66; Fraustadt, *Encomiorum in Litteris Graecis usque ad Romanam Aetatem Historia* (1909), especially pp. 46–47, 73–75.

² These were often connected with an implied praise of their opposites; cf. Volkmann-Hammer, *loc. cit.*

³ E.g., the *Laudes Italiae*, for which as a literary topic cf. Bauck, *De Laudibus Italiae* (1919).

⁴ In a verse form cf. the *Mosella* of Ausonius.

⁵ E.g., *Laus Romae*; cf. Gernents, *Laudes Romae* (1918). Praises of Athens formed a regular part of conventional Athenian *ἐπιδείξεις*; cf. also Hermog. *Progygmn.* vii. 12 Sp.; Nic. *Sophist. Progygmn.*, p. 480 Sp., who tells how to praise a citizen of Siphnos when there is nothing worthy to be said of his country!

⁶ Cf. Menand. *Rhet. περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, p. 332 Sp.

⁷ Dio Chrys. xxxiii. 11 says that Homer eulogized almost everything, beasts, plants, water, earth, arms, and horses, and vituperated Thersites alone. We have not here the technical *laudatio*, of course, yet it should be noted that many of the later formal compositions of this type took their text from Homer, and were expansions, as it were, of themes found in the Homeric poems.

But it is not this large field of the *laudatio* as a whole that I shall here plough over, but rather a curiously miscultivated portion of it to which the term "adoxography"¹ has been given, in which the legiti-

¹ This type was definitely recognized in antiquity; cf. Menand. Rhet. *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, ii. 1. 346 Sp.: *ιστέον ὅτι τῶν ἐγκωμίων τὰ μὲν ἐστὶν ἔνδοξα, τὰ δὲ ἄδοξα, τὰ δὲ ἀμφίδοξα, τὰ δὲ παράδοξα. ἔνδοξα μὲν τὰ περὶ ἀγαθῶν ὁμολογουμένων, ὅλον θεοῦ ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς ἀγαθοῦ φανεροῦ. ἄδοξα δὲ τὰ περὶ δαιμόνων καὶ κακοῦ φανεροῦ· ἀμφίδοξα δὲ ὅσα πῇ μὲν ἔνδοξα ἐστί, πῇ δὲ ἄδοξα. . . . παράδοξα δὲ ὅλον Ἀλκιδάμαντος τὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἐγκώμιον, κτλ.*; Gell. xvii. 12. 1-2: *infames materias, sive quis mavult dicere inopinabiles, quas Graeci ἀδόξους ὑποθέσεις appellant, et veteres adorti sunt non sophistae solum sed philosophi quoque, et noster Favorinus oppido quam libero in eas materias <sc> deiciebat vel ingenio expergificando ratus idoneas vel exercendis argutiis vel edomandis usu difficultatibus, sicuti cum Thersitae laudes quaesivit et cum febrim quartis diebus recurrentem laudavit, lepide sane multa et non facilia inventu in utramque causam dixit eaque scripta in libris reliquit.* For more modern discussions cf. Allatius on Michael Psellus (in *Patrol. Gr.* cxvii. 515); Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene* (1869), pp. 154-55 (who uses the term "Adoxographie"); von Arnim, *Dio von Prusa* (1898), p. 12 (who remarks: *Neben den grossen ἐπιδείξεις politisch-symbolischen Inhalts verfaest er [sc. Gorgias] παύγια, d.h. Reden, die an einem willkürlich gewählten und an sich bedeutungslosen Gegenstand die formale Kunst des Redners zur Schau stellen und sogleich dem Hörer oder Leser Unterhaltung bieten sollen. Hauptsächlich sollen diese παύγια die sophistische Kunst des Lobens und Tadelns in Musterstücken veranschaulichen: die Macht der Rede, das Kleine gross, das Grosse klein, das Gute böse, das Böse gut erscheinen zu lassen. Die sogenannten ἀδοξοὶ ὑποθέσεις bieten die beste Gelegenheit, für diese Kunst des Redners Reclame zu machen*); Rohde, *Der gr. Roman* (3d ed., 1914), p. 331, and n. 2; Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (1901), p. 342, and n. 1 (who uses the English term "adoxography," not found in the *New English Dictionary*). The fullest account appears to be that in Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (1902), pp. 157-66, but there are many instances which he does not record. There may also be mentioned a note by Walden, *Universities of Ancient Greece* (1909), p. 264.

The most extensive collection of material is that by Caspar Dornavius, *Amphitheatrum Sapientiae Socraticae joco-seriae, hoc est, Encomia et Commentaria Autorum, qua veterum, qua recentiorum prope omnium: quibus Res, aut pro vilibus vulgo aut damnois habitae, Styli Patrocinio vindicantur, exornantur, etc.*, in two folio volumes with pp. 854+305, Hannover, 1619. This work, to which I shall make frequent reference, was in some respects more inclusive than the present article, containing many instances of short descriptions, especially in verse, excerpted from works of very different character, as well as many encomia in which little or no paradoxical element is present. In other respects the field of Dornavius is narrower than mine, for he makes no attempt to trace the history of the type, to list instances from ancient authors no longer extant, or to discuss the corresponding theme of paradoxical vituperations. The vast majority of his 624 titles, arranged under 169 different headings, are by authors of the Renaissance or later. In 1619 there appeared at Munich the work of Hendrik van Put (Puteanus), *Bruma: Chimonopaegnion de Laudibus Hiemis, ut ea potissimum apud Belgas; in 1626 at Frankfurt a supplement to Dornavius' work, containing five anonymous encomia: Encomium Invidiae. Caecitatis. Neminis. Frigillae. Pelicani. The Dissertationum ludicarum et Amoenitatum Scriptores varii* (1638; and a second edition, Leyden, 1644) adds little to our particular field as represented in the preceding titles, but the *Admiranda Rerum admirabilium Encomia. Sive diserta & amoena Pallas disserens seria sub ludicra Specie*, published at Nymwegen in 1666, offers a half-dozen additions to its predecessors.

mate methods of the encomium are applied to persons or objects in themselves obviously unworthy of praise, as being trivial, ugly, useless, ridiculous, dangerous, or vicious.¹ What brilliant mind first devised this form of intellectual gymnastics we shall perhaps never know, but it appears as early as the time of the famous Gorgias himself. The encomia on Palamedes and on Helen ascribed to him may or may not be genuine,² but his younger contemporaries, Polycrates, with his praises of mice³ and of pebbles,⁴ Isocrates,⁵ with his *Helen* (probably written in emulation of the *Helen* of Gorgias just mentioned) and his *Busiris* (in which he attempted to improve upon the treatment of the same theme by Polycrates), and Alcidas, with his praise of death⁶ (these last two the pupils of Gorgias) show this literary type as fully established by the end of the fifth century. Noteworthy in this connection is a statement in Plato's *Symposium*:

Many sophists also, as for example the excellent Prodicus, have descanted in prose on the virtues of Heracles and other heroes; and, what is still more extraordinary, I have met with a philosophical work in which the utility of salt has been made the theme of an eloquent discourse; and many other things have had a like honor bestowed upon them.⁷

During the Roman Empire, and particularly in the age of the second sophistic, this sort of exercise was also in vogue, and the names of Dio Chrysostom, Fronto, Favorinus, Proteus the Cynic, Lucian,⁸

¹ The corresponding form of the ψόγος is the blame of that which is admittedly beautiful, great, valuable, or otherwise excellent; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* i. 3; i. 9; Aphthon. *Progymn.* ix. 40 Sp.; Aristid. *Ars rhet.* i. 506 Sp.; Alex. *Rhet. περί ήητορ. άφορμών*, p. 3 Sp.; Nic. *Sophist. Progymn.*, p. 482 Sp.

² Von Arnim (*Dio von Prusa*, p. 12) is disposed to accept his encomia as genuine, and thinks that there is no doubt that Gorgias composed *παίγνια* and treated *άδοξοι ύποθέσεις*; so also Fraustadt, *op. cit.*, p. 45. Christ, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, I (6th ed., 1912), 547, thinks the *Helen* and the *Palamedes* certainly genuine. For the writing of such works by Lysias (von Arnim, *loc. cit.*) the evidence seems none too clear; compare, however, Christ, *op. cit.*, I, 558.

³ Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 24. 6.

⁴ Alex. *Rhet. περί ήητορ. άφορμών*, p. 3 Sp.

⁵ On the hostility of Isocrates to this type of composition cf. Burgess, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-60, quoting Isocr. *Helen*, 1-18.

⁶ Cic. *Tusc.* i. 116; Menand. *Rhet. περί επιδεικτικων*, ii. 1. 346 Sp.; Tzet. *Chil.* xi. 747-51.

⁷ P. 177b (Jowett's translation). Cf. the hypothetical praise of the ass in Plat. *Phaedr.*, p. 260b. Aristotle (*Rhet.* i. 9. 1366 a 29 ff.) distinguishes encomia into *παίγνια*, i.e., *χωρίς σπουδής*, and *σπουδαίοι λόγοι*.

⁸ Lucian's real feeling Burgess (*op. cit.*, p. 159) would perhaps detect in his criticism of these themes in *Charidemus*, 14.

Philostratus,¹ Libanius, Synesius,² and others continue the tradition, which during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and in more modern times, has not lacked its representatives. To seek the causes of so long-continued and widespread an epidemic of apparent nonsense is perhaps not without its value, and I shall suggest several possible contributory reasons.

In the first place, the panegyric was a comparatively harmless form of activity to which were increasingly diverted many of those rhetorical energies which, during the independent greatness of Greece, had entered political oratory, and during the Roman Empire, when oratory had to turn itself in considerable measure into artificial and, to our way of thinking, futile channels, even laudation and vituperation might have their perils if they praised or blamed too warmly a contemporary whose position was liable to change, or if, on the other hand, by seeking refuge in antiquity, they invited comparisons between the ancient personages discussed and their modern descendants or analogues. But whimsical or obviously paradoxical writing as well as praise or blame of the inanimate or that which lay beneath envy appeared eminently safe.

Furthermore, the familiar commonplaces, including the praise and blame of characters and qualities universally recognized as established in virtue or the opposite, respectively, had, after much use, become threadbare.³ What easier way, then, to renown than by a paradoxical espousal of the unpopular or the despised? A large part of the effectiveness of humor has always been felt to lie in the introduction of the unexpected,⁴ and such clever entertainers of the public as were the sophists could hardly be supposed to overlook this obvious opportunity.

¹ Philostratus (*Vit. Apollon.* iv. 30) describes a youthful poetaster who had composed encomia upon gout, blindness, and deafness, and makes Apollonius sarcastically advise him to eulogize dropsy, catarrh, and various mental diseases.

² Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene* (1869), p. 155, remarks that there is in antiquity no worthy representative of the type after the time of Synesius.

³ Cf. Isocr. *Helen*, 11-12; Virg. *Georg.* iii. 3-8.

⁴ Cf. such modern instances as DeQuincey's *Murder Considered as One of the Fine Arts*; Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-glass*; Dr. Crothers' *Anglo-American School of Polite Unlearning and The Hundred Worst Books*; and many another modern essay. See also Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene*, p. 155, and, for the Athenian fondness for the representation of the ridiculous, Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 157. Münscher (in *Rh. Mus.*, LIV [1899], 248) thinks Antisthenes and the cynics the source of many such paradoxical encomia.

Again, the sophistic training, so far as it aimed at any practical result, had sought to prepare men to speak in public, in the assembly, the courtroom, or before smaller groups, and in these speeches to defend, like modern debating teams—in some ways the spiritual heirs of the sophists and their pupils—either side of a question¹ or even both sides successively.² On topics upon which public opinion recognized but one side as right, there was, then, that necessity of making the worse appear the better reason which had been the besetting temptation and the most frequent ground of reproach of the sophists from as early as the fifth century.³ Yet what better training, from the sophistic standpoint, than this exercise of defending the indefensible or salvaging the universally rejected? The opportunity thus afforded for self-display on the part of the clever sophist himself, ever engaged in the trade of self-exploitation, is evident, for the more violent the *tour de force* the greater, in case of success, the resultant éclat.⁴

The two causes last mentioned apply rather to the more paradoxical forms of this type than to the mere glorification of the trivial and the minute. For this branch of adoxography two other tendencies must also be reckoned with. The trend of art during the period in which this style was developing was, in both literature and sculpture,⁵ in the direction of realism, and from the realistic, the *genre scene* (in literature in such forms as the mime), and the study of the commonplace, the transition to the *ἀδοξοὶ ὑποθέσεις* was an easy one; in fact, the whole distance had been already traveled.

Further, for the great interest in natural science, which had characterized the Greeks from the days of their first philosophizing,⁶

¹ Cf. Christ, *op. cit.*, II, 1, 546; also the *controversiae* of the schools.

² Cf. Libanius' *ψόγος* 'Αχιλλέως and his *ἐγκώμιον* 'Αχιλλέως; also his vituperations of riches and poverty. Plut. *Alex.* 53 tells of the skill of Callisthenes in this respect.

³ Of course, in this matter as in others, *abusus non tollit usum*. But note the cautions expressed by Aristotle (*Top.* viii. 9).

⁴ Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* vii. 1146a) remarks that men desire to prove paradoxes in order that they may, if successful, be considered clever.

⁵ Phidias himself is said to have made in bronze not only a cicada and a bee (aristocrats among the animals of their size) but also a fly (Julian, *Ep.* 67 [Wright]), and this centuries before Lucian had written his encomium on the fly.

⁶ We may go yet farther back, for Pliny (*N.H.* xxix. 28) remarks: *non Homero [sc. "fastidio fuit"] . . . improbitatem muscae describere* (cf. *Il.* xvii. 570-72). Of the *Batrachomyomachia* I shall say a word later. Such scientific interest in the minute is ridiculed by the conservative Aristophanes when he represents Socrates as investigating the length of the jump of the flea (*Nub.* 144 ff.; cf. Eunap. *Vit. Philos.*, p. 462).

but which had increasingly, from the time of Aristotle, concerned itself with the study of the more lowly forms of animal and vegetable life, no least detail was too trivial for earnest consideration, for to the true philosopher the skill of the divine workmanship was as evident and as admirable in the minute as in the grandiose. As Augustine well remarks: "The divine creation is so great and so wonderful that not only in man . . . but also in the smallest fly it brings, to one who observes aright, amazement of mind, and begets praise for its creator";¹ and again: "Those are most wonderful which are least in size, for we are more struck by the achievements of ants and bees than by the vast bulk of whales."² On the purely scientific side, then, such subjects as the more insignificant animals gained both interest and importance,³ and the modern essay on similar topics, such as the writings of Maeterlinck and Fabre on the bee and Lafcadio Hearn on the sounds of insects, though not cast in the rhetorical form of the *laudatio*, may be considered as performing a somewhat similar function. And we must not forget that the sophists, like the philosophers, professed to inform as well as merely to dazzle. Naturally the language employed on these themes degenerated at times into bombast. Demetrius remarks: "Clitarchus . . . when describing the wasp . . . says: 'It lays waste the hill-country, and dashes into the hollow oaks.' This might have served for a description of some wild ox or of the Erymanthian boar, rather than of a species of bee. The result is that the passage is both repellant and frigid."⁴ Through this interest in the phenomena of natural science, then, men's eyes had been focused upon the tiny, and the encomium of the minute took its place beside those other forms of the little so dear to the taste of the Alexandrians and their imitators, the epyllion, epigram, idyl, character, and mime.

¹ C.D. xxii. 24. 644 (Hoffmann). Cf. Dornavius, *op. cit.*, Preface, pp. 1-2: *addo: quoties res damnosae praeconiis exornantur elucere haud obscuram Dei providentiam: quae examussum, etiam perniciosissima, alicui bono vertit; magmento divinae maiestatis. porro dum aut exiles reculae, oratione exsplendescunt: aut illae suis virtutibus proferuntur, quae non cuivis erant obviae; etsi inter viles non plane recensitae: tum profecto apparent Sapientiae Dei certissima vestigia; quae in minimis perinde tota est, atque in maximis.*

² C.D. xxii. 24. 648 (Hoffmann).

³ Cf. Virg. *Georg.* iv. 6: *in tenui labor; at tenuis non gloria*. For the references to bees in ancient literature see Robert-Tornow, *De Apium Mellisque apud veteres Significatione* (1893). The Alexandrian feeling for the romantic elements in everyday life is discussed by Headlam in his edition of Herodas (1922), p. xxiii.

⁴ *De Eloc.* 304.

From the causes enumerated—the search for a form combining brilliancy and safety, the striving for novelty by the path of paradox, the sophistic desire to present effectively the inferior side of a case, the tendency of the age toward greater realism and the consequent exploration of the undiscovered possibilities of the commonplace, and, finally, a real scientific interest in the microscopic—from some or all of these, in varying measure at different times and in the hands of different sophists, seems to have developed the type we are discussing. Resulting from many causes, it naturally had affinities with various other literary genera. Just where the boundaries lie between the ordinary encomium and adoxography it is not always easy to say, for what to one reader may seem the sincere praise of a worthy object to another may appear but hollow bombast. To descriptions written as an end in themselves, rather than as parts of a larger whole, such as the *Imagines* of Philostratus, or the various accounts, now in prose, now in verse, of villas, mountains, springs, baths, and similar things, as in Pliny's *Letters*, the *Silvae* of Statius, or miscellaneous poems of Claudian and Ausonius, our type may at times show some likeness.¹ Again, to the class of scientific monographs upon particular plants² or animals it approaches in such a way as to make it difficult to determine with certainty the exact status of works known to us only by title. Another type of monograph is the Theophrastean character, which differs from adoxography both by its curious combination of cynicism with exact scientific observation and by a comparative free-

¹ Dornavius' work includes a number of such, in which the paradoxical element is largely or completely lacking.

² For encomia on such cf. Hermog. *Progymn.* vii. 13 Sp.; Dionys. *Rhet.* 6. Allatius (in *Patrol. Gr.* cxxii. 516) lists a number of encomia upon plants, which he seems to have compiled from various references in Pliny's *Natural History*. Thus Pliny says (xx. 33) that Chrysippus, Dieuches, Pythagoras, and Cato praised *brassica*; that (xxv. 80) Themiso wrote a book on *plantago*; that (xxv. 72) Erasistratus praised *lysimachia*; that (xix. 94) Pythagoras composed a book on *bulbi* and (xix. 87) Moschion one on the radish, while Phaniass (xxii. 35) treated the praises of the nettle and Diocles (xx. 19) those of the *rapus*. Doubtless most, if not all, of these works were not pure *laudationes*, but rather medico-botanical treatises, like the Pseudo-Apuleian *De Herbarum Medicaminibus*; yet cf. Quintil. iii. 7. 28: *somni et mortis scriptae laudes, et quorundam a medicis ciborum*; also the *ἐγκάμιον φοίνικος καὶ μηλέας* of Libanius (viii. 273–77 [Foerster]). Again, such works bulk very large among the humanistic instances collected by Dornavius. Libanius' *ψόγος ἀμπέλου* (viii. 324–28 [Foerster]), though cast in the rhetorical form and containing some purely fanciful arguments, is, for the most part, occupied with the standard objections (ancient and modern) to drunkenness, and is therefore not to be classed among the purely paradoxical topics.

dom from the merely paradoxical.¹ From the mock epic of the type of the *Batrachomyomachia* and from epyllia such as the *Culex*² the adoxographic work is distinguished by its lack of plot; from the beast fable by its lacking an outstanding moral; from the mime by the absence of dramatic action. Many an epigram³ discusses themes as unpromisingly homely or at times as paradoxical as these, but the brevity and the verse form of the epigram are convenient external marks of differentiation. The *suasoria* and *controversia*, though, like these, epideictic types, are composed ostensibly with reference to some resultant action, while the encomium looks toward the present or past rather than the future, and aims at information or amusement rather than at conviction. Much closer in spirit and subject matter lies the essay,⁴ which often in modern writers such as Swift and Lamb contains distinctly adoxographic elements. If it be objected that the essay is much wider in its inclusiveness than the adoxographic type we may readily grant this, and if anyone claim that the essay is primarily a written form and adoxography ostensibly an oral performance we may admit this also. Yet that these *παύγια* should form one element in the ancestry of the essay there seems nothing to prevent, especially when we observe that even in antiquity they were by no means confined to speeches intended for oral delivery, but are found in other guises as well, especially in the epistle.⁵ From the developed form of the satire, as found in Horace or in Persius and Juvenal, adoxog-

¹ The *Characters* of Theophrastus are nominally about types of men, but they may also be viewed as a vituperation of those unfortunate qualities which most of these unhappy men illustrate. In this connection reference may perhaps be made to what Philostratus (*Vit. Sophist.* i. 481), says of the differences between the first and the second sophistic.

² Cf. Stat. *Silv.* i, *praef.*: *et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam* [sic] *etiam agnoscimus, nec quisquam est inlustrum poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissione praeluserit.* Cf. such later works as Spenser's *Muiopotmos, or the Fate of the Butterflie*; Samuel Butler's *Cynarctomachy, or Battle between Bears and Dogs*; etc.

³ E.g., some of the shorter poems of Claudian and many in the *Anthologia Latina*, not to mention Martial and parts of the *Palatine Anthology*.

⁴ Cf. Gummere in *Classical Weekly*, XIV (1921), 157, and n. 13 on the likeness of our type to the English essay.

⁵ Thus Fronto's works of this class; Philostr. *Ep.* 16, which is a short discussion in praise of hair; the first part of Julian *Ep.* 80 (Wright) is, in essence, a praise of figs; while the pseudo-Clementine *Homil.* v. 10-19 contains, in the form of a fictitious letter written by one Appion to an imaginary woman, a *μοιχείας ἐγκώμιον*, the reply to which is given by the author of the homily himself in secs. 21-26.

raphy is distinguished by its prose garb and by its more monographic and less discursive character, but the satiric spirit is often not wanting in it and has become even more prominent in some of its late descendants.

On account of its possibilities as a field for training in debate, the adoxographic genus seems to have been widely employed in the schools as a definite exercise. Polybius,¹ in speaking of Timaeus, says that he praised Sicily as extravagantly as do the lads in their conversations and arguments in their paradoxical efforts,² when they set themselves to eulogize Thersites or vituperate Penelope, or to treat some other such theme. He further remarks that these sophistical quibbles had inspired the young men with so depraved ideas that they paid no attention to ethics and politics, which benefit those who study them, but spent their time in pursuit of an empty reputation for useless and paradoxical verbiage. At least as late as the time of Augustine³ boys in school were set as subjects for compositions encomia of the sun, the heavens, the earth, the rose, the laurel, and similar topics. Doubtless some of the adoxographic writings of which we have knowledge belong to this class of schoolboy exercises, yet the greater number of those which attained to fame were surely the work of the teacher, the sophist himself, "half professor, half journalist," as Gomperz⁴ well calls him, perhaps occasionally composed as models for his pupils, but probably more often as a means of self-advertisement, to win a certain *kôdos*, especially when he could outdo a colleague.⁵ Even philosophers, like Favorinus, might, as a dialectic exercise, resort to such subjects.⁶ Philostratus,⁷ in speaking of Dio of Prusa, says: "As for his *Tale of Euboea*, the *Encomium of a Parrot*, and all those writings in which he handled themes of no great importance, we must not regard them as mere trifles, but rather as sophistic compositions; for it is characteristic of a sophist to devote serious study to themes even so slight as

¹ xii. 26b.

² πρὸς τὰς παραδόξους ἐπιχειρήσεις.

³ *Enarrat. in Ps.* cxliv. 7.

⁴ *Gr. Denker*, I (1st ed., 1893), 333.

⁵ On the jealousy of sophists for one another cf. *Aug. Conf.* i. 15, and many passages in other writers.

⁶ *Gell.* xvii. 12. 1-2.

⁷ *Vit. Sophist.* i. 7 (the translation is that of Mrs. Wright).

these."¹ The more trifling the theme, the less which could obviously be said in its support, the greater the distinction of the encomiast in inventiveness and clever verbiage.²

Much freer in its arrangement than the more strictly logical forms of eloquence, the adoxographic production laid chief emphasis upon the number, variety, and unexpected character of the arguments adduced for praise.³ Thus Aristotle⁴ informs us that the encomium of Polycrates upon mice dwelt upon their services to the Egyptians in gnawing the bowstrings and shield-handles of the enemies invading Egypt;⁵ Philostratus' praise of hair⁶ gives examples of long-haired heroes at Troy, of highly fanciful analogies between human hair and many objects in nature and art, and of other animals and even gods represented as having long hair, recalling that short hair is the characteristic sign of mourning.⁷ Appion's praise of adultery⁸ enumerates the amours of Zeus and the other gods and the benefits conferred thereby upon the human race, with examples from the precepts and practice of the philosophers. Libanius, in his *Encomium of Thersites*, declares that he was of good parentage; praises his courage in joining the Trojan expedition when, on account of previous injuries, he might easily have stayed at home; declares that his speech against Agamemnon is the utterance of righteous indignation, showing that he was, like Demosthenes, careless of his own welfare in comparison with the

¹ Like the successors of the sophists, the college professors! Cope on Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 24. 6, remarks: "It might have been supposed that these ingenious exercises were intended for burlesques, were it not that Aristotle by quoting arguments from them shews that they had a serious purpose."

² Cf. Allatius in *Patrol. Gr.* cxxii. 517. Yet Isocrates (*Helen* 11-12) feels that it is much harder to praise the familiar and meritorious in a manner both serious and novel than to be amusing and clever in the praise of the paradoxical: "About the honored there is little to be found which no one has said before; in regard to the mean and lowly whatever one happens to say is individual."

³ Volkmann-Hammer, *Rhet. d. Gr. u. Römer* (3d ed.), p. 34. Libanius usually begins with an apology for defending the unpopular side, and an assertion of his disregard for mere opinion, authority, or popular prejudice, and his thoroughgoing devotion to the search for truth; cf. the eighth volume of Foerster's edition (pp. 243, 282, 290, 306, 324).

⁴ *Rhet.* ii. 24. 6.

⁵ Cf. *Hdt.* ii. 141.

⁶ *Ep.* 16.

⁷ He ends with the melancholy words: *φίρ' εἶπω σοι τὸν ἐπιτάφιον τῆς κόμης· ὦ κάλλους ἀκρόποδς, ὦ ἔρωτος ἄλσος, ὦ ἄστρα κεφαλῆς.* Fronto's *Laudes Fumi et Pulveris* (pp. 211 ff. [Naber]) give elaborate instructions for this sort of composition, including generous padding with mythology, quotations from the poets, proverbs, and fables.

⁸ Ps. Clem. *Homil.* v. 10-19.

public good, being in this respect the superior of the prudent trimmer, Nestor; and asserting that the Greeks, as a body, really approved his words. Finally, Libanius praises him for not deserting to the Trojans after the affront which he had received. Synesius, in his *Praise of Baldness*, written as a counterblast to Dio's *Praise of Hair*, admits that he is growing bald, but seeks consolation in the reflection that hairiness and bestiality go ever together, while man's surface is by nature mostly free from hair. He asserts that the noblest men, such as priests and philosophers—those who have really used their brains—are usually bald. Of all forms, moreover, the smooth sphere is the most perfect, and the soul naturally yearns, like deity, to inhabit such a sphere, which in the case of man is the bald head. In short, these encomia seem to have resorted to all the four methods of praise noted by the theorist, Aristides:¹ exaggeration of meritorious features, suppression of the undesirable ones, favorable contrasts with something else, and a fourth which he calls *εὐφημία*, the clever turning of an unpleasant fact to a pleasant one.

We are now perhaps ready for a brief but more systematic enumeration of the subjects selected for praise in those ancient adoxographic works which are extant or known to us by title. The praise of ugly or bad men and the disparagement of the good may be well illustrated by four different encomia of Thersites,² ugliest of all the Greeks who came against Troy, and those of Polyphemus by Zoilus,³ and of the mythical inhuman Egyptian king Busiris⁴ by Polycrates and by

¹ *Ars rhet.* i. 505 Sp.; the terms are *αἰξήσις*, *παράλευσις*, *παραβολή*, and *εὐφημία*. Cf. also what he gives as an example of *αἰξήσις* as applied to an encomium on ants. On p. 506 Sp. he recommends the same four methods for vituperations, substituting, however, *δυσφημία* for *εὐφημία*. Quintil. iii. 7. 6 says, *proprium laudis est res amplificare et ornare*.

² Polyb. xii. 26; Gell. xvii. 12. 2; cf. also the praise of Thersites in Aeneas, *Ep.* 15 (*Epist. Gr.* 27 (Hercher)), and the laudation by Libanius (viii. 243–51 (Foerster)). From the four cases of this most unpromising subject, taken from a familiar passage in Homer, we may infer that it was a favorite topic for such discussions, as, indeed, we might gather from the terms in which Polybius describes it and the direct statement of Quintil. iii. 7. 19 that Thersites was also a typical theme for vituperation. Cf. also Ov. *ex Pont.* iii. 9. 9–10: *sic forsitan Agrius olim / Thersiten facie dixerit esse bona*.

³ Cf. Christ, *op. cit.*, I, 580.

⁴ Virgil's expression (*Georg.* iii. 5): *inlaudati . . . Busiridis* is probably with reference to customary vituperations of this king. The *Busiris* of Isocrates is extant, and in sec. 4 he refers to the *Busiris* of Polycrates, upon which he desired to improve. Cf. Quintil. ii. 17. 4; Fraustadt, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–53. Philod. *Rhet.* i. 216–17 reads: *ἀλλ' οἱ ῥητορικοὶ σοφισταὶ Βουσεΐριδας καὶ Πολυφύμους καὶ τοιοῦτους ἄλλους ἐγκωμιάζοντες τὰ*

Isocrates. Perhaps rather in the class of what Menander¹ reckons as τὰ ἀμφίδοξα falls that challenge to rhetorical ingenuity² to be found in the vindication of Helen, which was undertaken by Gorgias in his *Helen* and rivaled by the *Helen* of Isocrates,³ who tried to introduce entirely new grounds of praise. The speech of accusation against Socrates written by Polycrates⁴ may belong in the serious category of propagandist writing, like the *Cato* of Cicero and the *Anticatones* of Caesar, but the vituperation of Penelope, of which Polybius speaks,⁵ is surely a mere *tour de force*, as are also those of Achilles and Hector by Libanius.⁶ It is in these laudations and vituperations of persons that the adoxographic type approaches most nearly to the practical application in courts of law and the popular assembly.

Of external personal peculiarities the presence or absence of hair seems to be the favorite, which is perhaps not strange, if we remember to what an extent beards and hair appear during the Empire as the distinguishing marks of certain types of philosopher. Dio of Prusa⁷ essayed the defense of hair, and Synesius⁸ the more difficult champion-

τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἑπαθλα κοινοποιούσι καὶ πολλοὺς εἶναι πονηροὺς προτρέπονται, κτλ. Cf. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 166. Dornavius, *op. cit.*, II, 18 ff., reprints apologies for Phalaris, Apuleius, Epicurus, Nero, and Julian by writers of the Renaissance or later. In more recent times, but with historical rather than rhetorical purpose, we may compare such works as Beesly's *Catiline*, *Clodius*, *Tiberius*, or, from the vituperative side, the ostensibly "true" biographies of great historic characters like Washington, in which the popular estimates of them are reversed.

¹ *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, ii. 1. 346 Sp.

² Cf. Van Hook, *Greek Life and Thought* (1923) p. 164. Leo Allatius (in *Patr. Gr.* cxxii. 516) states that one Bruno Nolanus is said to have recited at Wittenberg a *praeconium diaboli*; cf. Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, *praef.* 1.

³ Cf. Fraustadt, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-51.

⁴ Isocr. *Busir.* 4; Quintil. ii. 17. 4. A reply was made by Lysias; cf. Thalheim's edition of Lysias, 370, No. 113.

⁵ xii. 26b.

⁶ viii. 282-96 (Foerster).

⁷ Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene*, p. 154; von Arnim, *Dio von Prusa*, pp. 154-55, who thinks the parts of this which are quoted by Synesius are unworthy of Dio's skill, and probably represent an abridgment by Synesius in order to save space.

⁸ Hucbald of St. Amand in the ninth century wrote an *Ecloga de Calvis*, in praise of baldness; cf. Manitius, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit. d. Mittelalters*, I (1911), 590-91. The poem is reprinted by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 290-91, and consists entirely of words beginning with the letter c (doubtless chosen as the initial of *calvis*). Several of the works listed by Dornavius in his Table of Contents under the captions "Pili" and "Barba" are really chiefly medical rather than rhetorical in character. On the attitude of the ancients toward baldness cf. Headlam's edition of Herodas (1922), int. I, n. 1, who quotes the oriental proverb, "Long hair and little wits."

ship of baldness. Diseases, such as quartan fever,¹ gout, blindness, deafness,² and insomnia,³ and natural processes, such as sleep,⁴ received their due attention; the works on old age⁵ and on death,⁶ however, are perhaps philosophic and consolatory rather than sophistic and paradoxical, like the praises of work and of poverty which appear in many writers,⁷ and like the whole category of the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Among the faults or sins thus praised are negligence⁸ and adultery.⁹

¹ Praised by Favorinus; cf. Gell. xvii. 12. 2-5; see also Plut. *de rect. Rat. aud.* 13, who mentions praises of vomiting and of fever. A lengthy encomium of quartan fever in particular by Menapius is given by Dornavius (*op. cit.*, II, 183-91).

² The works on gout, blindness, and deafness mentioned by Philostratus (*Vit. Apollon.* iv. 30) are perhaps typical rather than actual, like those which he sarcastically suggests on dropsy, catarrh, and various mental diseases, but they may be literally paralleled in later literature; e.g., Pirkheimer's *Laus Podagrae* (given by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, II, 202-14), and similar works by Pontanus (*ibid.*, pp. 214-15), Cardan (*ibid.*, 215-19), Joannes Carnarius (*ibid.*, pp. 219-23), and others (*ibid.*, pp. 223-61), with which cf. Christ, *op. cit.*, II, 2, 716, n. 3 (apropos of the *παραδοξολόγια* of Lucian). With Milton's *Sonnet on His Blindness* our works have little comparison, but regular encomia on blindness are found, such as those given by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, II, 261-64, especially the "Tiresias, seu Caecitatis Encomium" by Jacob Gutherius (published in the *Admiranda Rerum adm. Encomia* [1666], pp. 245-76) and an anonymous "Encomium Caecitatis" (in *Encomium Invidiae, etc.* [1626] pp. 20-24). Some modern essays have dealt with the consolations of deafness, with which cf. Martin Schoock's "Surditatis Encomium" (in the *Admiranda Rerum adm. Encomia*, pp. 602-25).

³ Cf. Fronto *Ep.*, p. 9 (Naber): *accipe nunc perpaucula contra somnum pro insomnia*; but he jestingly ends: *haec satis tui amore <potius> quam meae fiduciae luserim. nunc bene accusato somno dormitum eo; nam vespera haec ad te detexui. opto ne mihi somnus gratiam referat.*

⁴ Quintil. iii. 7. 28.

⁵ For lists of such in antiquity see the note in my edition of Cicero *de Div.* on ii. 3 (p. 351). Philostr. *Vit. Apollon.* v. 4 speaks of altars erected to old age, poverty, etc.

⁶ E.g., by Alcidas (see above; also Quintil. iii. 7. 28).

⁷ See the collections of W. Meyer, *Laudes Inopiae* (1915), who argues for an encomium on poverty as the source of the *agon* of the *Plutus* of Aristophanes. Menand. *Rhet. περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, ii. 1. 346 Sp. notes a work in praise of poverty by Proteus the cynic; cf. Volkmann, *Rhet. d. Gr. u. Römer* (2d ed., 1885), p. 316, n. 3, for the correct reading of this passage. Libanius (viii. 311-15 [Foerster]) has a *πόνου πέντας* and (*ibid.*, pp. 306-11) a *ψόγος πλοῦτον*; Heraclides of Lycia wrote a *πόνου ἐγκώμιον*, described by Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* ii. 26 as a *φρόντισμα οὐκ ἀγδές*, but from the title of which Ptolemy the sophist at Naucratis cut off the initial letter, leaving it as an *δρου ἐγκώμιον*. Works in praise of poverty are given by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, II, 170-74; on pp. 175-76 he gives Robert Turner's encomium on debt.

⁸ Fronto *Ep.*, p. 214 (Naber).

⁹ Ps.-Clem. *Homil.* v. 10-19. Among later writers may be noted Dornavius' own *Invidiae Encomium* (II, 298-304) and an anonymous work on the same topic (*Encomium Invidiae, etc.* [1626], pp. 3-20); praises of lying (Dornavius, *op. cit.*, II, 284-98), flattery (*ibid.*, pp. 128-29), drunkenness (*ibid.*, pp. 25-40); etc. Isocrat. *Helen* 8 seems to hint at encomia upon beggars and outlaws; cf. Münscher in *Rh. Mus.* LIV (1899), 248.

Of animals we find representatives of those which are more or less homely or mean, such as the ass,¹ the horse,² the cow,² the parrot,³ the ant,⁴ and the bumblebee,⁵ but also of those which are annoying or dangerous, as flies,⁶ gnats,⁷ fleas,⁸ lice,⁸ and bedbugs.⁸ Of encomia of plants I

¹ Cf. Plat. *Phaedr.*, p. 260b; p. 39, n. 7 above. Such an essay was actually composed by D. Heinsius (1623; enlarged edition, 1629), and even earlier Sidney in his *Defence of Poesie* had referred to a work on this theme. Two such are published by Dornavius (*op. cit.*, I, 498-500) along with various verses on the subject; cf. also Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXXV (1909), 453, No. 115. Charles Lamb's *Elia* contains an essay on the ass.

² Cf. Hermog. *Progymn.* vii. 11 Sp.; Aphthon. *Progymn.* viii. 36 Sp.; also the *ἐγκώμιον βοῦς* of Libanius (viii. 267-73 [Foerster]). Encomia on horses given by Dornavius (*op. cit.*, I, 489-92), and written by Lipsius and Camerarius, are really but selections from larger works.

³ By Dio Chrysostom; cf. Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* i. 7; Synes. *Dio*, p. 36P. (in Budé's edition of Dio, II, 406). For the same theme see also Stat. *Silv.* ii. 4, and the *Encomium Psittaci* of Aldrovandus (Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 366-69). Aldrovandus also eulogized the swan (*op. cit.*, I, 371-73), the dove (*ibid.*, pp. 374-75; 379-80), the eagle (*ibid.*, pp. 381-85), the goose (*ibid.*, pp. 399-400), and several other birds.

⁴ Aristid. *Art. rhet.* i. p. 504-6 Sp.; cf. later the *Laus Formicae* reprinted in the *Admiranda Rerum adm. Encomia* (1666), pp. 57-73, where it is said to be by Melanchthon, though by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 80-83 (under the title *Encomium Formicarum*) it is ascribed to Erasmus Ebner. Dornavius reprints (I, 83-87) another *Formicarum Encomium* by Aldrovandus, as well as various more or less scientific articles on ants (I, 88-110). Aldrovandus similarly praised the spider (I, 111-12), beetle (I, 125-26), worm (I, 173), glow worm (I, 170), etc.

⁵ Isocr. *Helen* 12. Blass, however, took the *βομβύλιον* for a kind of drinking-vessel. The lengthy encomium of Aldrovandus on the bee is found in Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 129-41, followed by several similar discussions (*ibid.*, pp. 141-57) by others.

⁶ The extant *Encomium Muscae* of Lucian is one of the most famous of the type. At its end he remarks: πολλὰ δ' ἐτι ἔχων εἰπεῖν καταπαύσω τὸν λόγον, μὴ καὶ δόξω κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ἐλέφαντα ἐκ μυίας ποιεῖν. For the encomium on the fly by the indefatigable Aldrovandus and for one by Francis Scribanus see Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 119-24.

⁷ Dio Chrysostom's *κῶνος τοῦ ξαίματος* (Synes. *Dio*, p. 41P, in Budé's edition of Dio, II, 412), a companion-piece to Lucian's *Praise of the Fly*, is reckoned by Synesius as one of Dio's best works; cf. von Arnim, *Dio von Prusa*, p. 154.

⁸ Psellus wrote on all these lively topics; cf. Allatius in *Patrol. Gr.* cxxii. 515, who seems to imply that the work on the flea is distinct from his work *πρὸς τὸν μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ εἰπόντα μήποτε δηχθῆναι ὑπὸ ψύλλης*. Also cf. Tzet. *Chil.* ii. 185. Dornavius (*op. cit.*, I, 21-76) not only offers three humanistic Latin encomia on the flea but also several poems, and a large bulk of German verse on the subject. There seems to have been an extensive flea-literature in Germany in the sixteenth century, of which a conspicuous example is Johann Fischart's *Flöhhatz*, a "Tierepos" to which Professor C. A. Williams, of the University of Illinois, has kindly called my attention. The most famous work on the louse is that by D. Heinsius (Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 78-80), but a dispute between two kinds of lice occurs in a German song of the sixteenth century; cf. Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXXVII (1911), 266. Aldrovandus honors the bedbug with perhaps the briefest and least enthusiastic of his many encomia (Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 77). On the rules for composing the praises of animals cf. Hermog. *Progymn.* vii. 13 Sp.; also passages in most of the other theorists.

have already spoken; in the field of inanimate objects we find thus honored the Dog Star,¹ pots,² pebbles,² salt,³ wine,⁴ figs,⁵ the lyre,⁶ dust and smoke,⁷ and even ashes and dung.⁸

Mediaeval examples of this type are to be expected, but since I have made no attempt to search for them I may merely mention as having come to my notice the work of Hucbald in the ninth century in praise of baldness and the lucubrations of Michael Psellus the younger in the eleventh, of which I have already spoken. With the sixteenth century, however, a large new crop ripens. The famous satire of Erasmus, the *Moriae Encomium*, or *Praise of Folly*,⁹ is probably the most noted as well as the most serious in a group which includes such masterpieces as Daniel Heinsius' praises of the ass and the louse, Wilibald Pirckheimer's praise of gout, Scaliger's of the goose, Lipsius' of the elephant, Aldrovandus' endless encomia, and those many others, some of them already mentioned, which crowd the pages of Dornavius' *Amphitheatrum*, while Sidney, in his *Defence of Poesie*, remarks: "We know a playing wit can praise the discretion of an ass, the comfortableness of being in debt, and the jolly commodities of being sick of the plague"; and again: "Agrippa will be as merry in

¹ Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 24. 2. To appreciate the paradoxical element in this it must be recalled that the appearance of this star was the sign for hot and unwholesome weather; cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii. 13. 9, and many passages in other authors.

² By Polycrates, according to Alex. *Rhet.* *περὶ ῥητορ. ἀφορμῶν*, p. 3 Sp.; Plut. *de rect. Rat. aud.* 13 also mentions such a work.

³ Plat. *Sympos.*, p. 177b; Isocrat. *Helen* 12.

⁴ Psellus, *ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν οἶνον*; cf. *Patrol. Gr.* cxvii. 515. But Libanius (viii. 324-28 [Foerster]) has a *ψόγος ἀμπέλου*. The work of Pittacus on meal to which Allatius (*Patrol. Gr.* cxvii. 516) refers I have not been able to trace.

⁵ Julian *Ep.* 80 (Wright).

⁶ By the sophist Lycophron, according to [Alex. Aphrod.] on Arist. *Soph. Elench.*, p. 174 b 30.

⁷ Fronto's *Laudes Fumi et Pulveris*, pp. 211 ff. (Naber); cf. his *de Fer. Als.* iii. 7, where he alludes to it as among his *nugalia*. Martin Schoock composed a "Fumi Encomium," to be found in the *Admiranda Rerum adm. Encomia* (1666), pp. 626-50. For a "Luti Encomium" by Maioragius see *ibid.*, pp. 405-47.

⁸ Aug. *de vera Relig.* 77: *cineris et stercoris laudem verissime atque uberrime plerique dixerunt*; but perhaps cf. Cato *de Agr.* lxi. 1; Cic. *de Sen.* 54. For a sixteenth-century German song with a dispute between "Ross- und Kühtreck," see Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, XXXVII (1911), 266. In this category may be noted certain short works included by Dornavius, *op. cit.*, I, 348-49: *Podicis Encomium*, *Latrinae Querela*, etc.

⁹ In his preface Erasmus reviews similar works in classical antiquity.

the shewing the vanity of science¹ as Erasmus was in the commending of folly."

In this brief sketch I have not attempted an exhaustive treatment, especially for any period after the Roman, but the instances cited are sufficient, I think, to indicate that this ancient type of the whimsical or paradoxical declamation, passing more and more into strictly written rather than purely oral form, and, in the sixteenth century and later, more and more stressing the satiric rather than the rhetorical element, has had a long, if not a highly exhilarating, history, and that it merits serious attention from the student of the origins of the modern essay.

AMHERST COLLEGE

¹ In his *de Incertitudine et Vanitate Scientiarum et Artium atque Excellentia Verbi Dei Declamatio*, published in 1531.

L. ANTISTIUS RUSTICUS

BY SELATIE EDGAR STOUT

In *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LV (1924), 5-20, Professor D. M. Robinson publishes an important new Latin economic edict, found in May, 1924, on the site of Pisidian Antioch, giving plates, text, translation, and commentary. The text of column I of this inscription is here given from his Plate II. The changes from his text will be discussed below.

[L. Antistio -n. -f.] | Gal(eria tribu) Rustico, co(n)s(uli), | leg(ato) Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) [Domit]iani Aug(usti) [Germanici] |⁸ pro pr(aetore) provinciarum | Capp(adociae), Galat(iae), Ponti, Pisid(iae), | Paphl(agoniae), Arm(eniae) Min(oris), Lyca(oniae), praef(ecto) | aer(arii) Sat(urni), proco(n)s(uli) provinc(iae) Hisp(aniae) | Ult(erioris) Baetic(ae), leg(ato) divi Vesp(asiani) et divi Titi |¹⁰ et Imp(eratoris) Caesaris [Domit]iani Aug(usti) | [Germanici] Leg(ionis) VIII Aug(ustae), cura | tori Viarum Aureliae et Corne | liae, adlecto inter praetorios | a divo Vespasiano et divo Tito, |¹⁵ donis militaribus donato ab isdem, | corona murali, cor(ona) vallari, | corona aurea, vexillis iii, | hastis puris iii, trib(uno) mil(itum) Leg(ionis) II | [A]ug(ustae), xvir(o) stlitibus iudicand(is), |²⁰ patrono coloniae, quod | [ind]ustrie prospexit annon(ae).

The inscription on the narrow column II contains the edict. It is complete and fills the column without leaving any unused space at the top or bottom. The letters of this column are much smaller than those of the other columns, and the stonecutter must have traced them out completely before cutting in order to be able to fit the long inscription so exactly into the available space. Columns I and III show unused space below the inscriptions, but the first lines begin very close to the upper edge of the stone. If there were no other evidence, this would suggest, since the stone is so symmetrically arranged, that the inscriptions of both columns I and III are incomplete at the top.

It is clearly impossible that *RUFO PROC AUG* of column III is the complete original of the inscription of that column. This procurator was an *eques* who had advanced to a very important and responsible position. He would not be named in such an inscription

merely by his cognomen. Robinson suggests that the stone which is shown by the marks on our stone to have been above it contained the honors and the rest of the name of Rufus. This suggestion can be accepted only in part. The cognomen is on our stone. The rest of the name must therefore have immediately preceded it on the last line of the upper stone. But the honors of a man are never given in inscriptions before his name. This unparalleled order is not to be thought of here. It is of course possible that *Rufo* is in the ablative, and that a portion of the space above the name was used to tell what he had done. This would give a vertical continuation to the inscription of column III without a corresponding inscription above column I. This again must be rejected because of the carefully planned symmetrical arrangement of the stone. We conclude that there was but one line above what we have of the inscription, and that this line contained the nomen and praenomen of Rufus above column III.

Robinson expands *Gal. Rustico* in the first line of column I as *Gal(erio) Rustico*, and explains the unusual abbreviation of *Galerio* as due to the influence of the Greek over the Roman practice. There seems to be no other evidence of the influence of the Greek over the Roman practice in this long inscription. Robinson's expansion makes the inscriptions of columns I and II refer to two different men, both of them having the cognomen Rusticus, both governors of the administrative district in which Antioch was situated, both of whom had favored the city by special attention to its supply of grain in a year of famine, both honored (but separately) in the inscription carved on one stone. It would seem likely that all the inscriptions on this stone relate to one experience of famine and its relief, and an explanation that refers the inscriptions of columns I and II to one governor instead of two would on this ground seem preferable.

In column III we have seen that the part of the name of Rufus which preceded his cognomen must have occupied the portion of the last line of the superior stone immediately above column III. In the same way, we should assume that the praenomen, nomen, and indication of ancestry of L. Antistius Rusticus occupied the part of the last line of the superior stone above columns I and II. The name would thus read *L. ANTISTIO, -N. -F., GAL., RUSTICO*. Robinson's Plate I shows that in column I the letters of the top line on the present stone

are larger than those of the next lines, and that the letters of the line *RUFO PROC AUG* of column III are larger than those of the top line of column I. It is likely that the letters of the entire bottom line of the superior stone were of the same size, and that they were as large as or larger than those of the line *RUFO PROC AUG*. If this was the case, the letters *L. ANTISTIUS -N -F* would just about take up the space of the line above columns I and II, both of which would belong to the same man, whose name above them would in a way claim them for him. Allowing for letters of this height, for the space between the lines, and for a blank space on the upper stone as great as or slightly greater than that at the bottom of column I, the upper stone with only one inscribed line may have been forty or forty-five centimeters in height, or practically half the height of our stone.

In lines 8 and 9 of column I, Robinson expands as follows: *Proco(n)s(uli) provinc(iarum) Hisp(aniae) et Baetic(ae)*. This he translates, "proconsul of the provinces of Hispania and Baetica." This might mean that he had at one time had charge of the combined provinces of Hispania and Baetica, or that he governed them separately at different times. Neither of these meanings can be correct, for there was no province of Hispania. Up to the time of Augustus, Spain was divided into two provinces, Hispania Citerior and Hispania Ulterior. Augustus divided the peninsula into three provinces, which were commonly referred to as Hispania Citerior, Baetica, and Lusitania. The first is referred to as Hispania Citerior Tarraconensis in *CIL*, II, 4133. In the same way Baetica is referred to with various descriptive additions to its name. In XII, 3167, we find a *q(uaestor) Hispaniae Ulterioris Baeticae*; in XI, 3364, a *proconsul provinciae Baeticae Ulterioris Hispaniae*; in XI, 14, a *proconsul Hispaniae Baeticae*; in *Ephem. Epigr.* v. 696, a *legatus provinciae Baeticae Hispaniae*. This province was therefore variously called Baetica, Hispania Baetica, Baetica Hispania, Baetica Ulterior Hispania, Hispania Ulterior Baetica. Careful examination of Robinson's Plates I and II shows that the first letter of the word which he reads at the beginning of line 9 in column I as *ET* stands even with the second letters of the lines above and below, and that traces of a *V* are clear before it in both plates. *VLT* for *Ull(erioris)* should therefore be read instead of *ET*, giving *proco(n)s(uli) provinc(iae) Hisp(aniae) Ull(erioris) Baeti-*

c(ae) as the reading of this phrase in lines 8 and 9. This form of the name of the province is to be compared with that of *Tarraconensis* in II, 4133, and of *Baetica* in XII, 3167, both quoted above.¹

In lines 13 and 14 of column I, Robinson translates *adlecto inter praetorios a divo Vespasiano et divo Tito* by "appointed to the Praetorian Guard by divine Vespasian and divine Titus." This translation is virtually repeated in his analysis of the inscription, p. 9: "He had been granted by Vespasian and Titus the *adlectio* to the Praetorian Guard, and had been honored with many military memorials." *Adlectio* to the Praetorian Guard is a thing quite unheard of, and so far as I can see it would have no meaning. It could not mean "appointed to the Praetorian Guard." The soldiers of the Praetorian Guard were *praetoriani*; *praetorii* were men who had held the office of *praetor*. Robinson has evidently confused these two words.

To have been *praetor* was a prerequisite at this time to the holding of certain administrative positions. To hold the office of *praetor* required that the candidate, in addition to the preliminary service in one of the civil offices of the *vigintivirate* and in the military service as *tribunus militum*, should have held the quaestorship and either the aedileship or the tribunate of the *plebs*. By special act of the emperor, men who had not actually held one of these offices were sometimes advanced to the political standing, or class, of men who had held it. Such a promotion in standing was called *adlectio*. In the early principate such *adlectio* was made by the emperor acting as censor. Vespasian and Titus were censors in 73 and 74. They were so active in

¹ In *CIL*, II, 1970, no longer extant, where Rambertus reports *provinc. Uleris Hispan. Baetic.*, Bayer reports *Veteris*, and Hübner, in *CIL*, prints *provinc. Veteris Hispan. Baetic.*, we have an error similar to that of Robinson here. The correct reading is clearly *provin[c(iae)] Uleri(or)is Hispan(iae) Baeticae*.

In II, 5439, Tab. 2. 4. cxxvii (in the *Lex Ursonensis*), the inscription reads, *si quis praef(ectus) fabrum eius mag(istratus) prove magistral[u] qui provinc(iarum) Hispaniar(um) Uleriorem Baeticae pra[e]erit optinebit er(ig)it*, etc. This text defies all construing. Dessau (*Inscr. Sel.* 6087) brackets *Baeticae pra[e]erit* and says that these words are an evident insertion. When this *lex* was written, about 44 A.D., the governor of Hispania Ulterior, in which the Colonia Genetiva Iulia was situated, was clearly designated by *qui provinciarum Hispaniarum ulteriorem optinebit*. When it was recut in the form in which we have it, probably in the Flavian period, after the division of Hispania into three provinces, this designation would not be definite, and *Baeticae pra[e]erit* was clumsily added to show that the governor of Baetica was meant. A few such emendations constitute an important part of the evidence that the inscription, as we have it, is not in its original form.

revising the lists of the senate and the *equites* that Suetonius makes special note of it in his biography of Vespasian (chap. ix): *Amplissimos ordines et exhaustos caede varia et contaminatos veteri negligentia purgavit supplevitque, recenso senatu et equite, summotis indignissimis, et honestissimo quoque Italicorum ac provincialium adlecto*. That they considered their work in this office a real service to their country is indicated by the fact that the title of censor is listed among their honors in most of their inscriptions after their censorship. From about 87 Domitian bears the title *censor perpetuus*, which indicates that he found the censor's powers useful for constant exercise.

The effect of *adlectio inter quaestorios, aedilicios, tribunicios, or praetorios* was to confer upon persons so advanced the rights and privileges of those who had held these offices. In particular, they became eligible to hold administrative positions that were open only to those who had held the office to whose rank they had been advanced, and might become candidates for the next higher office of the regular *cursus*. It is to be noted that Rusticus did not hold the office of *quaestor, aedile, tribunus plebis, or praetor*. Care has been taken to mention both of the unimportant offices which were preliminary to the quaestorship. Then follows immediately in his list of honors the *adlectio* to praetorian standing. We may be sure, therefore, that *quaestor, aedilis, tribunus plebis*, would appear among his honors if he had held these offices. The censors of 73-74 therefore advanced him at one bound from the political standing of a *tribunus militum* to that of an *ex-praetor*. A similar elevation at one step to praetorian standing is seen in the case of an *eques* in *CIL*, VI, 1359: *L. Baebio L. F. Gal. Auito, praef. fabr., trib. mil. Leg. X Gem., proc. Imp. Caesaris Vespasiani Aug. provinciae Lusitaniae, adlecto inter praetorios*. Rusticus was of senatorial family, as is shown by the first two positions that he held. His membership in the *tribus Galeria* and his friendship with Martial suggest the possibility that he was from Spain. His apprenticeship in military service also was in Legio II Augusta, which was long in Spain and had gone from there to Britain. Vespasian made his first reputation as *legatus* of this legion in Britain. It would not be unnatural if he kept up an especial interest in his old legion and that meritorious service in it did not escape his attention. We may fairly assume that after his service as *tribunus militum*, ordinarily a six

months' service but often longer, Rusticus did not at once seek further political office, but returned to private life, perhaps devoting himself to the management of his own and his wife's property (Mart. iii. 75); that by 73-74 he had attained an age and experience appropriate for praetorian commands; and that by this *adlectio* of the imperial censors he was enticed back into the public service. That such advancement need not be accepted and followed up by service in administrative positions to which he was thereby made eligible is shown by Plin. *Epp.* i. 14. 5: *Pater Minicius Macrinus, equestris ordinis princeps, quia nihil altius voluit. Adlectus enim a divo Vespasiano inter praetorios honestam quietem huic nostrae ambitioni dicam an dignitati constantissime praetulit.* Rusticus, however, chose to re-enter political life. After his curatorship of the *Viae Aurelia et Cornelia*, he became *legatus Legionis VIII Augusta*, another praetorian office. He remained with this legion several years, for he went to it before the death of Vespasian and was still serving with it under Domitian. His *dona militaria* were won as *legatus* of this legion, as is shown by *vexillis iii, hastis puris iii.*² They were won before the death of Vespasian, since they were presented by Vespasian and Titus. His proconsulship of Hispania Ulterior Baetica followed. The tribuneship of the Aerarium Saturni, an important and burdensome office (cf. Plin. *ad Traianum* 3a), crowned Rusticus' career of praetorian service, and, as in the case of Pliny the Younger and often in this period, was followed immediately by the consulship. His service in offices of the Praetorian grade was long, which would in a way compensate for his omission of quaestorian and aedilician service.

Robinson incorrectly places the consulship last in this governor's career, apparently because the honors are arranged in descending order and the consulship is named first. I suspect that this error may have been responsible for his conclusion that the inscriptions of columns I and II belong to two different men; for Mart. ix. 30, which he uses very neatly to fix the lower limit of the date of the inscription, shows that L. Antistius Rusticus died in Cappadocia, presumably while governor there, while Robinson's inference from the position of *cos.* in column I seemed to require that the Rusticus of that column

² For a convenient brief statement of the interpretation of the numerals in such *dona militaria*, see Egbert, *Latin Inscriptions* (rev. ed.), p. 193, n. 5.

was consul after his Cappadocian legateship. The consulship is usually placed immediately after the cognomen rather than in its chronological position among the honors, whether these be arranged in descending or in ascending order. This fact is too well known to require further comment here. The fact that the governors of the Cappadocia-Galatia group of provinces at this period were regularly of consular rank is another reason for placing this office of Rusticus after his consulship.

Among the extensive changes made in the administrative arrangements of the east by Vespasian in the first years of his reign Suetonius notes (*Vesp.* viii. 4): *Cappadociae propter adsiduos barbarorum incursus legiones addidit consularemque rectorem imposuit pro equite Romano*.¹ We learn from Tacitus, also, that no legions were quartered in Cappadocia at the beginning of Vespasian's reign (*Hist.* ii. 82): *Sed inermes legati regebant, nondum additis Cappadociae legionibus*. Joseph. *Bell. Iud.* vii. 1 tells us that Legio XII Fulminata was sent at this time to this province, and located at Melitene. It is not known what other legion was sent to Cappadocia at this time, but both Suetonius and Tacitus used the plural of *legio*, and the fact that the governor under the new arrangement was of consular rank is in harmony with this. At the time when Suetonius and Tacitus wrote, Cappadocia still kept her two legions and her consular governor. The legions and the governor of higher standing and larger experience were required not so much because of conditions in the province as to counteract the influence of the Parthians and to support the Roman party in the neighboring kingdom of Armenia. These objects they succeeded in accomplishing very effectively.

Armenia Minor, which had been attached to Galatia since 54, was attached permanently to Cappadocia after the legion was sent to its chief city, Melitene.² Galatia and the districts that were nor-

¹ The excellent translation of Suetonius by Rolfe in the "Loeb Series" makes a slip here. "He sent additional legions to Cappadocia" is quite impossible from the standpoint both of the Latin and of history. Some expression for "the forces of Cappadocia" must be substituted for *Cappadociae* before the Latin will bear this translation. We should also expect a numeral with *legiones*.

² This is the chief objection to Domaszewski's dating in the time of Antonius Pius of the Galatian governorship of the Sospes of *CIL*, III, 6818. Armenia Minor was included in his command, and it is scarcely possible that Armenia Minor was attached to Galatia when the large Cappadocia-Galatia administrative district was broken up at

mally under the care of her governor—Paphlagonia, adjacent sections of Pontus and Phrygia, Pisidia, Isauria, Lycaonia, Armenia Minor—were placed under the consular governor of Cappadocia. Coins continued to be struck both at Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, and at Caesarea, in Cappadocia, but both bore the name of the governor of the larger complex of provinces; and the one governor had charge of the construction and maintenance of roads in the whole territory. This large administrative unit was kept together under the charge of a consular governor until late in the reign of Trajan.¹

We are therefore not only permitted, because of the common practice of placing *cos.* immediately after the name rather than in its chronological position among the honors in inscriptions, but we are required by the fact that the governor of these provinces in the Flavian era was of consular rank to assume that the last office held by the Rusticus of column I was the governorship of Cappadocia and the districts regularly attached to it at this time. This fits well with the other considerations that point to the conclusion that the Rusticus

the end of Trajan's reign. This is almost equally true of Pontus Galaticus and Pontus Polemonianus, which were also in his command. The extent of his province fits much better with the proposal of Brandis (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real. Encycl.*, Vol. XIII, Sp. 551) to date his administration before the provinces were united under Vespasian. He does not discuss the apparent difficulty in this dating arising from the fact that Sospes was *curator coloni(a)rum et municipiorum*, while the earliest datable mention of *curator rei publicae* is under Trajan. Liebenam (*Philologus* LXV [1897], 292) states that of the nearly four hundred inscriptions in which *curatores rei publicae* are mentioned, none can with certainty be dated earlier than Trajan. I have examined not all, but a great many of these, without finding an exception to his statement. It is not likely, however, that there were no preliminary experiments with this office before it came into such general use under Trajan. At any rate, this is the lesser of the two difficulties, and Brandis' suggestion seems the more probable. The only thing that is certain, however, in regard to the date of his administration is that those scholars (Liebenam, *Die Legaten in den röm. Provinzen*, p. 173; Dessau, *Inscr. Sel.*, 1017; Steh, *Senatores Romani qui fuerint inde a Vespasiano usque ad Traiani exitum*, No. 205, p. 32; and others) who, following the suggestion of Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.*, IV, 447), place his administration of Galatia just after ca. 90 cannot be right.

It should be added that until the publication (ca. 1888) of *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies*, Vol. II, at Athens, in which (No. 98) Sterrett gave the correct reading of this inscription, the name had been incorrectly given as Sollers, and on a conjecture of Borghesi (*Oevr.*, VI, 411) connected with Bellicius Sollers and with the Sollers of Plin. *Epp.* v. 4.

¹ There has been some confusion on this point, but I think no scholar will now challenge the statement. The administrative arrangements in the Cappadocia-Galatia area at this period are discussed by Ritterling, *Jahresh. d. Österr. Inst.*, X (1907), 299 ff.

of column I is L. Antistius Rusticus of column II rather than a Galerius Rusticus—another man unknown up to this time.

It would be regular for the *procurator Augusti* to take charge of the province upon the death of the governor until the arrival of the new appointee. If, in this year of famine and stress, he, *vice praesidis*, had part in carrying out the decree of the dead governor, his presence in this inscription and the space reserved for him would be satisfactorily accounted for. It is not impossible that the intention was to add an inscription below his name when he left the province or surrendered the administration of it to a new *legatus Augusti pro praetore*. For some reason this was not done, and in the ample space left *TIBERIA PLATEA* was later cut. This evidently had no place in the inscription as at first planned.

One other point in Robinson's text deserves notice. In column II, line 11, he gives *b(ono) te(mpori)*, evidently in the dative case, perhaps on the analogy of *Ἀγαθῇ Τυχῇ*, and translates, "with good fortune." I know of no Latin parallel to this abbreviation, nor to the phrase, and think the translation is much forced. Moreover, the *B* is only partly made on the extreme edge of the column, quite out of line with the first letters of the lines above and below, does not correspond in size to the other letters, and may not be a letter at all. There seems to be room for only one letter before the *o* of *omnes*. The ligature for *TE* does not seem certain. Some word for "therefore," which Robinson uses in the translation, seems required. It is possible that the edict read here *eo omnes*, and that the stonecutter lost one of the *o*'s, giving *EOMNES*. The omission of *eo* or some equivalent expression is certainly awkward. If this suggestion is correct the sentence would read:

Cum iiviri et decuriones splendidissimae coloniae Antiochensis scripserint mihi propter hiemis asperitatem annonam frumenti exarsisse petierintque ut pleps copiam emendi haberet, eo omnes qui Antiochensis coloniae aut coloni aut incolae sunt profiteantur, etc.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE PANHELLENIC LEAGUES. II

BY J. A. O. LARSEN

To complete the study of the position of the synedrion in the central government, it is also necessary to consider its relation to the hegemon, or king, and the latter's personal representative already referred to above. In the first place, it should be noted that the word "hegemon" now seems to have become an official designation for the head of the Hellenic league and is not merely used to describe the *de facto* leader of the country.¹ Nevertheless, care must be exercised in drawing conclusions from this title concerning the constitutional position of the hegemon. There probably were no features of the Hellenic league that were not copied from or suggested by some of the institutions of earlier Greek leagues and alliances. Yet the one feature that seems most original is the monarchical element introduced in the shape of the office of hegemon, though even this was foreshadowed by the leadership of such men as Lysander and Epaminondas, a leadership which might be called a *de facto* monarchical hegemony, not to mention the position of the Persian king after he had imposed the King's Peace on the Greeks.² Nevertheless, something can be deduced from the fact that in the Hellenic league, the hegemony was an actual office conferred upon the king and his descendants and confirmed by the treaties that served as a constitution of the league.³ From the point of view of the king, this had the decided advantage that it furnished a constitutional basis for his demands upon the Greeks. In their heart of hearts, they might feel that he was a conqueror imposing his will upon them, but he was able to point out that he made his demands as hege-

¹ It must be admitted that the use of the word in the literary sources by no means shows that it is an official title. Its failure to appear in *SEG*, I, 75, also might arouse suspicion. However, its use in *Dit.*, *Syl.* (3d ed.), 260, seems conclusive. Its significance in the league of Philip II is discussed by Wilcken, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Korinthischen Bundes*, *Sitzungsberichte*, Munich (1917). Cf. p. 316, n. 3, of this article in *Classical Philology*, October, 1925.

² *Der Grosskönig konnte . . . tatsächlich als der Hegemon der hellenischen Staaten angesehen werden* (Kraus, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I [2d ed.], 271).

³ *Dit.*, *op. cit.*, 260. Cf. *SEG*, I, 75; III, 30-31.

mon of their league, and that these demands were in accordance with treaties to which they themselves had sworn. But it was a sword that cut both ways; it implied that the hegemon could not make demands except in accordance with the treaty.

The fact that the hegemony is an actual office with a constitutional basis must be a starting-point for a consideration of its relation to the synedrion. It is, however, possible also to discover some specific facts. In the league of Demetrius, for the duration of the war, the kings had the right of selecting the *proēdroi*,¹ and they or their representative had the right, in consultation with the *proēdroi*, to determine the time and the place for the sessions of the synedrion.² It has already been shown that the provision for the appointment of the *proēdroi* probably was an innovation introduced by Demetrius, but the right to call special meetings of the synedrion under certain circumstances is likely to have belonged also to the earlier league.

The representative of the king just mentioned is referred to once as the general left behind by the kings for the protection of the common interests of the league,³ and once as the general appointed by the kings. This makes it clear that the person in question is a military commander, and Wilcken's conjecture is probably correct, that he is the commander of the garrison which at the request of the Corinthians was placed by Demetrius in the citadel of their city.⁴ The origin of the recognition of the right of the hegemon to appoint a representative to act for him in his dealings with the league can only be guessed at. Antipater certainly exercised such power for Alexander. It is therefore likely that this provision goes back at least to Alexander. If not, we can only conclude that it was later decided to give constitutional recognition to the usage earlier employed. If no provision of the kind had been included in the treaties of Philip, but Alexander later desired it, he may have secured supplementary treaties, or he may have had Antipater's position recognized at the meeting of the synedrion at which the war resolution was adopted.⁵

¹ *SEG*, I, 75; II, 36.

² *Ibid.*, I, 75; II, 11-17.

³ ἐπὶ τῆς κοινῆς φυλακῆς.

⁴ *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), p. 139.

⁵ *Ps.-Dem.* xvii. 15 would also seem to indicate that in the days of Alexander the subordinates of the hegemon were recognized as having authority. See p. 54, n. 1, of this article.

differences
K. Y. Z.
K. Y. Z.

Hegemon
guardian
of peace
K. J. Z.

The first of the two titles used about the representative of the king suggests that the king, acting in person or through this representative, was the guardian of peace and law within the league. A proof of this is found in the fact that in the league of Philip II and Alexander the Macedonian authorities were supposed to co-operate with the syndrion in maintaining order and preventing revolutions within the cities of the league.¹ It is likely that in the case of open revolt and violation of the treaty the hegemon was thought to have a right to act without consulting the syndrion. In 336 Alexander did not wait for action by the syndrion, but at the first sign of unrest he appeared and demanded his position as hegemon recognized by the individual members of the league, and in 335 again, he did not wait for its decision before he attacked Thebes. Normally, however, the hegemon in dealing with members of the league seems to have been bound by the action of the syndrion, whose word was final. This, at least, is the natural conclusion from the fact that the decrees of the syndrion are said to have full validity.² When it is remembered that the treaty is one between kings and members of the league, it is fairly safe to conclude that the decrees are *kúpia* not only in relation to the states within the league, but also in relation to the kings. If the latter had had any veto power, we should expect the statement about the validity of the decrees to have been weakened or modified in some way.

In case of offenses against the league, the offenders were tried by the syndrion while the hegemon took part in the execution of the

Ps.-Dem. xvii. 15. The expression used here is *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ φυλακῇ τεταγμένοι*. The plural makes the expression a bit more indefinite than the one used in our inscription. Still it is likely that the person referred to here also is first and foremost the commander of the garrison at Corinth. Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, I, 38, interprets the expression as referring to a committee of the syndrion. Kaerst (*Rheinisches Museum*, LII [1897], 532 f.) carefully analyzes *Ps.-Dem.* xvii. 15 and shows that the reference must be to the Macedonian authorities. He later defends the same point of view against attacks in *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I (2d ed.), Beilage III. Wilhelm (*Attische Urkunden*, p. 47), rejects Kaerst's conclusions but without attempting to meet his arguments and also considers the officials in question a committee of the syndrion. Ferguson (*Greek Imperialism*, p. 30) follows Wilhelm. The latter found an argument in the fact that some such committee was needed for the conduct of business when the syndrion was not in session. This is true enough, but the Epidaurian inscription has shown that the *proëdroi* formed such a committee and must have been distinct from *οἱ ἐπὶ τῇ κοινῇ φυλακῇ τεταγμένοι*. The whole question has been discussed by Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), 139 f.

² *SEG*, I, 75; II, 18. Cf. p. 322, n. 3, of this article in *Classical Philology*, October, 1925.

judgment, at least when the offender was not an individual but a state. An example is the destruction of Thebes by Alexander. In our inscription, as has been stated above, the jurisdiction of the syndedrion is especially mentioned in the case of the *proëdroi*,¹ and apparently no exception is made in the case of the war-time *proëdroi* appointed by the kings. The syndedrion, also, was given jurisdiction in case of offenses against members of their own body or others traveling in league interests.² It is further implied that the syndedrion judged cases of actions hostile to the kings and cases of rebellion and revolution in the various states constituting the league.³ Proof that this interpretation is correct, and that the same rule held good also in the earlier Hellenic league, is found in the complaint of Aeschines that the Athenians had refused to give up Demosthenes and allow him to be judged by the "syndrion of the Hellenes,"⁴ in the trial of the Thebans by the syndrion after the capture of the city in 335,⁵ in the treatment of the Spartans after the battle of Megalopolis,⁶ and in the stipulation contained in Alexander's edict to the Chians that certain specified traitors were to be judged by the syndrion of the Hellenes.⁷ There is also preserved a record of a case in which Argos, acting in accordance with a decree of the syndrion, acted as arbitrator of a dispute between Melos and Kimolos.⁸ This points to another field in which the syndrion had the authority to judge, and suggests a necessary corollary to the stipulation that peace was to be maintained within the league, namely, that in case of dispute between members, the dispute was to be submitted to the syndrion, which then itself could settle the matter or delegate it to someone else, as was done in the case just referred to.

Thus the relation of the syndrion to the hegemon can be said to be this, that the syndrion passed the decrees deciding upon the course of action to be followed by the league and acted as a supreme court in case of offenses against the league and disputes between members of

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 75; II, 32-35.

² *Ibid.*, I, 75; II, 5-11.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 75; I, 20-29.

⁴ *Against Ctesiphon*, 161. The judicial activity of the syndrion is ably discussed by Kaerst, *Rheinisches Museum*, LII (1897), 521 f. His conclusion has received further confirmation from the Epidaurian inscription.

⁵ Arrian i. 9. 9; Diod. xvii. 14. 1.

⁶ Antipater referred the case to the syndrion, but it refused to act and passed the case on to Alexander (Diod. xvii. 73. 5).

⁷ *Dit.*, *op. cit.*, 283.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 261.

Constitution
Thebes

*

Philip

* Arrian

Summary &
Conclusion

Conclusion

the league; the hegemon enforced the decrees of the syndrion and put into execution the sentences handed down by it in its judicial capacity. When the hegemon wished to communicate with the syndrion, it is likely that the procedure for him was the same as for others, namely, to send a written communication to the *proëdroi*, who in turn would lay the matter before the syndrion.¹ If he addressed the syndrion in person, it would be in virtue of an introduction by the *proëdroi*, in the same way as ambassadors might be introduced by them.²

To sum up, at least as far as the constitutional theory is concerned, the chief organ of government of the Hellenic league was the syndrion, a representative assembly in which the various members of the league were represented in proportion to the population.² The members of this assembly had the full power to act and could not be held to account by their constituents. Its decrees were binding both for the members of the league and the hegemon, and as a law court it was the highest authority in the league. In connection with the syndrion, there was an executive board, the *proëdroi*, consisting of five members normally selected by lot from among the members of the syndrion. This was a standing committee functioning also when the syndrion was not in session, and had among its duties the task of summoning the members to the regular meetings of the syndrion, of co-operating with the hegemon or his personal representative in calling special sessions under certain circumstances, of acting as a go-between between the outside world and the syndrion, of arranging business to be brought before it, and of maintaining order at the meetings and punishing disorderly members. Nevertheless, in spite of its great powers, it was merely a committee of the syndrion responsible to it and liable to prosecution if it violated its trust. Finally, the head of the executive department of the government was the hegemon, the king under whose leadership the particular league had been organized. He was to hold office for life, and after him his descendants were to succeed by hereditary right. It was his task to enforce the decrees and sentences of the syndrion.

¹ SEG, I, 75; II, 28-32. In a different connection, Wilcken has shown that the Macedonian kings probably communicated with the Greeks by means of diagrammata or written statements (*Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes*, pp. 28 f.; *Sitzungsberichte*, Munich [1917]).

² SEG, I, 75; II, 26-27.

So far an attempt has been made to outline that part of the constitutional law of the league that concerned the synedrion. Even if this were nothing but a paper constitution, it would speak highly for the political imagination of the age that produced it. However, to see how far the form of government had penetrated the consciousness of the times, and how far it was a reality, it will be necessary to discuss how much of the Greek world it embraced, whether the kings in question actually allowed the league to function, and whether it had any hold on the minds of the Greek world.

A clue to the membership of the league is found in its name. The usual designation was merely "The Hellenes."¹ This need not mean that it was adopted as an official name in the modern sense. So far, there is no clear use of the term in any treaty that contained the league constitution. Nevertheless, the fact that it seemed natural to apply this name to the league would imply that it was fairly extensive. Among the few names in the mutilated list of members that has been preserved are found names of groups as far apart as Cephallenia, the Thessalians, and Greeks of Thrace.² A more clear proof of the inclusiveness of the league is found in the dedicatory inscription of the Persian suits of armor sent by Alexander to Athens after the battle of Granicus. These were described as dedicated by "Alexander, the son of Philip, and the Hellenes except the Lacedaemonians."³ The Hellenes here referred to certainly are the members of the Hellenic league.⁴ The implication is that all Hellenes except Sparta belonged to the league. Of course, many of those of Asia Minor had not yet been liberated, but they are treated as already members *de jure*.

¹ Wilcken, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes*, p. 6, n. 1; *Sitzungsberichte*, Munich (1917). It is easy to add to Wilcken's list of examples. Without making any pretense of being exhaustive, a few cases will be referred to. A decree (*δίκημα*) of the synedrion of the Hellenes is referred to in Dit., *op. cit.*, 261. In Alexander's letter to the Chians, there is one reference to the fleet of the Hellenes, one to a decree (*δίκημα*) of the Hellenes, and one to a trial of traitors before the synedrion of the Hellenes (Dit., *ibid.*, 283). Literary references are comparatively frequent. See Aechines *Against Ctesiphon* 161, 254; Diod. xvii. 48. 6; *ibid.* 73. 5; Hypereides *For Euxenippus* 20. In all of these, the reference is clearly to the league. The Epidaurian inscription gives little help here, since the parts concerned are mutilated. On this point see Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin (1922), p. 136.

² Dit., *op. cit.*, 260.

³ Arrian i. 16.7.

⁴ Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin (1922), p. 105.

From this evidence it is clear that the league was intended to be inclusive, and that this claim was kept up also by Alexander. Thus, in the case of particular states, the burden of proof rests not with those that wish to include them in the league but with those that wish to exclude them.¹ Consequently, the writer finds himself in agreement with the view now rather generally accepted, that Alexander included the Asiatic Greeks in the league.² On the other hand, Macedonia itself was not a member of the league.³

It has now been seen that the Hellenic league organized by Philip was intended to embrace all Greeks, or at least all that came under Macedonian influence. It is next necessary to try to see with what object and spirit it was organized, and what treatment it received at the hands of the kings who served as its hegemon. It is scarcely necessary to say that the judgment on this point, as on Philip II in general, varies. An interesting judgment is that of Ferguson, who states: "The hegemony of Macedon was sugar-coated, but it was none the less an hegemony, and, as such, illegal and unacceptable."⁴ In passing, the writer would remark that the discovery of the Epidaurian inscription has shown that it is impossible to pass a judgment on the Macedonian hegemony simply because it was a hegemony. It has rather rendered a renewed study of the whole idea of hegemon and hegemony necessary. The statement quoted is, however, correct in calling the Macedonian hegemony illegal in so far as the league was not due to volun-

¹ Justin ix. 5. 3; xii. 1. 7 also states that all Greeks except the Lacedaemonians belonged. These statements by themselves have little value. The first passage refers to the founding of the Hellenic league by Philip and so cannot possibly apply to the Greeks of Asia. The second passage refers to the rising in Greece under Spartan leadership in 331, so that it is possible to argue that it proves nothing except for the Greeks in Greece proper.

² For further arguments and for references to the earlier discussions, see Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin (1922), pp. 105 f.

³ Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, p. 18, on the basis of his emendation 'Ελεμ|ωρῶν in the list of members of the Hellenic league, argued that also the Macedonians belonged to the league. It is obvious that this is very slim evidence, for the emendation is uncertain. The opposite point of view is represented by Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I (2d ed.), Beilage III, and Wilcken, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes*, p. 5, n. 2; *Sitzungsberichte*, Munich (1917). Wilcken and Beloch (*Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. III [2d ed.], Part I, p. 576, n. 1), favor reading 'Αχαῶν Φθ|ωρῶν where Wilhelm has 'Ελεμ|ωρῶν. Wilhelm has since stated that he agrees with Wilcken in rejecting 'Ελεμ|ωρῶν. See *Anzeiger* of Vienna Academy (1922), pp. 67-68.

⁴ *Greek Imperialism*, p. 30.

tary action on the part of the Greeks but was forced upon them. They were no more free to join or refuse to join than the southern states were free to refuse to join the Union in 1865. But it was not illegal in the sense that the hegemon was bound by no rules and was free to lord it over the league as he chose. An attempt has been made above to prove that normally the hegemon must deal with the league and league members only through the *proëdroi* and the synedrion. Such, at least, were the provisions of constitutional law. Whether this law was observed, it must be admitted, is another question.

There can be no doubt that Philip intended to observe the laws of the league and constitutional procedure. This is indicated by his efforts to win the sympathy of the Greeks and to appeal to the Panhellenic movement that without doubt was a force to be reckoned with at the time. It is true that it was not strong enough to make all Greeks willing to acquiesce in the hegemony of Philip and to surrender the freedom of action of their cities in the interest of the league and Panhellenic co-operation. Still Philip clearly attempted to capitalize the movement, as can be seen already in his early connection with the Amphictyonic league. The staging of the organization of his league at Corinth clearly intended to suggest that it was a revival of the congress of Greek allies that had met at the isthmus in the days of the Persian War.¹ The plan to begin a national war against Persia likewise had a tendency to rally a certain amount of patriotism to the support of Philip, while the placing of the regular meetings of the synedrion at the Panhellenic games² was a clear bid for the support of whatever Panhellenic feelings existed.³

It can thus be said that Philip attempted to organize a league that would appeal to the members through its Panhellenic character and its connection with a great national cause. Then, too, this organiza-

¹ Thirlwall, *History of Greece*, VI, p. 75; Bury, *History of Greece* (2d ed.), p. 734; Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, I (2d ed.), 275.

² Already Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Vol. I (2d ed.), Part I, p. 162, n. 1, conjectured that the synedrion might have met at the Panhellenic games. *SEG*, I, 75; II, 11-12 and 17-18, in spite of that one of the passages required emendation, has made it certain that this rule held good in the league of Demetrius. If this is combined with the evidence already used by Droysen, it is fairly certain that the same rule also held good in the earlier Hellenic league. Cf. Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), p. 142.

³ The proviso for the policing of the sea and the freedom of the sea also appealed to many on the ground of economic interests (*SEG*, I, 75; I, 22; *Ps.-Dem.* xvii. 19).

tion was not intended to be merely a temporary one, but an organization for all time. This is indicated by the fact that the treaty of Athens with Philip contained an oath pledging friendship to the kingdom of Philip and his descendants. Furthermore, if the interpretation is accepted that the resolution to begin war with Persia was not adopted at the conference of ambassadors at which the league of Philip was organized, but was later passed at a regular meeting of the synedrion, the permanent character of the organization is still more evident.¹ The machinery of the league government was first set in order, and even the contingents to be furnished by the members in case of war arranged. After this was done, a meeting of the regular synedrion was held, and a national war decided on.

The fact that the Hellenic league in this period was looked upon as a permanent organization is seen even more clearly in the case of Demetrius Poliorcetes than in that of Philip II. It is possible to argue that for Philip the control of Greece was the main object and the war with Persia only an outgrowth of this main object. It is also possible to argue that Antigonus Monophthalmus and his son believed in granting Greece as much freedom as possible. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Demetrius organized his league at a time when war with Cassander absorbed his energies and made it necessary to attempt to rally the Greeks to his side. For this reason, regulations applying specifically to the war are included in his treaty,² and it is possible to argue that the founding of the league was merely a war measure.³ Nevertheless, provisions were made also for the time of peace,⁴ and the oath at the end of the treaty certainly contained a pledge of allegiance to Antigonus and Demetrius and their descendants.⁵ In other words, the league was intended to be permanent.

It has now been seen that the type of league organized by Philip was meant to be a permanent organization and to win the good will

¹ Wilcken, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes, Sitzungsberichte, Munich* (1917); Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. III (2d ed.), Part I, p. 602. Cf. pp. 315 f. of this article in *Classical Philology*, October, 1925.

² Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), p. 140.

³ Roussel, *Revue Archéologique*, XVII (1923), 139; Cary, *Classical Quarterly*, XVII (1923), 148.

⁴ *SEG*, I, 75; II, 12, 17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 75; III, 30-31.

of the Greeks. It remains to be seen whether the kings played the game fairly and observed their own rules. There is little to be said about Philip. In the case of the war resolution, he clearly is seen to have worked through the regular league organs, and it is likely that if he had lived, he would have continued to follow the same policy. Alexander, in his turn, in the early part of his career was equally scrupulous. After the death of Philip, he based his claims to the leadership of Greece entirely on his position as hegemon of the Hellenic league.¹ Likewise, in 335 he acted against Thebes as hegemon of the Hellenic league, attacked the city as a violator of the rules of the league, and, after its capture, turned the judgment over to the syned-
 rion.² Also in the latter part of his career, reference is frequently made to the league. The writer will not here attempt to take part in the detailed discussion concerning just what acts of Alexander were in accordance with the spirit of the league, and what acts were contrary to it.³ It seems, however, that though Alexander frequently acted perfectly properly as hegemon of the league, he also at times violated its laws, and that such violations became more frequent in the later part of his life. A change in his relation to the Greeks came with his deification. This made it possible to issue orders to them as an absolute monarch, and he promptly availed himself of the right.⁴ The new spirit is seen best in the decree for the return of the exiles. The preservation of existing conditions in the cities belonging to the league had been specifically guaranteed when the league was organized,⁵ so that one of its fundamental laws was now violated by Alexander. However, it hardly seems that the league was formally dissolved at the time.⁶ It is likely that Alexander avoided the odium of openly de-

¹ See pp. 315 ff. of this article in *Classical Philology*, October, 1925.

² Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), p. 103.

³ See particularly Kaerst, *Der korinthische Bund, Rheinisches Museum*, LII (1897), and Wilcken, *Alexander der Grosse und der korinthische Bund, Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922).

⁴ Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, pp. 147 f.; Kaerst, *op. cit.*; Wilcken, *op. cit.*

⁵ Dit., *op. cit.*, 260; *Ps.-Dem.* xvii. 10, 15, 16; *SEG*, I, 75; I, 27.

⁶ Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, p. 130, interprets the dismissal of the league contingents in 330 as an indication that Alexander no longer felt himself bound by the treaties made when the league was formed. Wilcken, *Sitzungsberichte, Berlin* (1922), p. 112, interprets their dismissal merely as a sign that the war, in so far as it was a Panhellenic undertaking, had come to an end. Wilcken further shows that even later Alexander paid some regard to the league and its ordinances. He believes that the league

stroying the league and instead chose the course of disregarding it or at least giving the syndrion no opportunity to make any important decisions. There is very little direct evidence on this point.

It is true that when Alexander, shortly before his death, sent Craterus home to succeed Antipater, the task of guarding or supervising the "liberty" of the Greeks was one of those assigned to him.¹ However, in this connection, "liberty" might just as well mean liberty under the protection of a god-king as inside of the Hellenic league. The most important proof that Alexander did not officially discontinue the league is found in the language of the decree of 319 of Philip Arrhidaeus (Polyperchon), where it is implied that any abuses of the rights of the league were due not to the king but to his generals.² This language could not have been used if Alexander himself had taken direct action against the league. Nevertheless, for all practical purposes, the deification of Alexander meant that the league was superseded by another form of government. It meant the substitution, even in the government of the Greeks themselves, of divine kingship for a form of government that we may probably venture to call approximately that of a modern constitutional monarchy with a representative assembly.

It is important, however, to notice that the mere deification of Alexander did not immediately decide the issue, but that for some time there continued to be a contest between the two forms of government. In this contest, the divine kingship finally won out and exercised a decisive influence on the structure of the government of the Roman Empire. This has had a tendency to obscure the importance of the other form of government and almost obliterate our knowledge of it. Nevertheless, an examination of the course of events will show that it had a strong hold on the minds of the Greeks and was resorted to several times by leaders who were seeking their support.

Nothing shows more clearly what hold the idea of the Hellenic league had upon the Greeks than the fact that when they rose against

continued to exist throughout the life of Alexander and was finally broken up when the Greeks organized their new league during the Lamian War. As far as the actual functioning of the league is concerned, this is probably correct, though in 319, Polyperchon made Philip Arrhidaeus speak as if the league never had been officially discontinued (Diod. xviii. 56. 3).

¹ Arrian vii. 12. 4.

² Diod. xviii. 56. 3.

Macedonian domination after the death of Alexander, they themselves made use of the machinery of the league against Antipater, the representative of its hegemon. The leaders in the revolt were the Athenians, who are said to have sought to secure for themselves the hegemony of the Hellenes.¹ The first official move on their part seems to have been the voting of a psephism in favor of action in behalf of the common freedom of the Greeks.² In the same psephism, it was also provided that ambassadors were to be sent to the other Greek states. They were to recall the fact that Athens had formerly fought the barbarians on the sea in the belief that Hellas was the common fatherland of all Hellenes, and now again she thought it necessary to fight in defense of the common safety of Hellas.³ In the light of the existence of the Hellenic league, and in the light of what followed, this can hardly mean anything else than that Athens invited the other Greeks to co-operate through the league against the Macedonians. The states that joined her in the movement sent representatives to the synedrion which now held its meetings in the camp of the allies.⁴ It was probably by the synedrion that Leosthenes was elected commander-in-chief of the forces of the allies.⁵

It is not easy to say what changes would have been introduced in the organization of the league if the Greeks had been victorious in the war. When it is said that Athens strove to attain the hegemony, this can hardly mean more than *de facto* leadership of Greece. It is not likely that she hoped to have any official recognition of her leadership like that granted by treaty to Philip and Alexander. At least, she cannot possibly have asked for this while she was summoning the Greeks to join her in a war for liberty, no matter what she might have sought later.⁶ Nor is it likely that Leosthenes was elected hegemon of the league. If he were given any of the titles earlier bestowed on the Macedonian kings, it must have been that of *strategos autokrator*. In other words, Leosthenes can hardly have been elected per-

¹ *Ibid.* 9. 1.

⁴ *Dit., Syl.* (3d ed.), 327.

² *Ibid.* 10. 2.

⁵ *Paus.* I. 25. 5.

³ *Ibid.* 3.

⁶ *Dit., op. cit.*, 327, almost certainly contained a reference to the *camp of the Athenians and their allies*. However, when it is remembered that this is an Athenian decree, the phrase cannot be held to prove that the position of the Athenians legally was different from that of the other allies.

manent head of the league but must rather have been made commander-in-chief for conducting the war against Antipater. The natural way of manipulating the league as a purely republican institution would seem to be to dispense with the hegemon and leave the presidency entirely to the *proëdroi*. The adoption of this course would be all the more natural since Athens was the leader, and it would be so perfectly in accordance with Athenian institutions. Furthermore, if, as is possible, the Greeks at the death of Philip II had failed to appreciate the validity of the principle of heredity,¹ it would be all the more natural that at the death of Alexander they should feel that there was no one with a hereditary right to the hegemony. Of course, they knew that the interpretation of Antipater and the Macedonians would be a different one, but why should they feel that their relation to Philip and Alexander meant the necessity to submit to anyone who in any way whatsoever obtained control of the Macedonian kingship? Thus, they might feel that the death of Alexander had actually brought about the condition that they had a league but no hegemon.

To be sure, it has been held that the synedrion of the Lamian War was nothing but a council of war or an assembly of the military leaders of the various contingents.² There are, however, several reasons for rejecting this suggestion. In the first place, when the Hellenic league was in existence at the time of the revolt, what would be more natural than for the Greeks to appropriate its machinery for their own purposes? In the second place, the language of the Athenian decree in honor of Timosthenes of Carystus³ is not such as we should expect if he were primarily a military leader. The most conclusive argument, however, is found in the attempt of the Greeks to negotiate with Antipater as a body, and the latter's reply that he would not negotiate with the league but only with the separate states.⁴ This incident could not possibly have occurred if the synedrion had been a mere council of war and was not looked upon as competent to negotiate a peace binding on all the members of the league. So useful had the league proved that even the most ardent champions of liberty

¹ See p. 317 of this article in *Classical Philology*, October, 1925.

² Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, I, 204; Wilhelm, *Attische Urkunden*, p. 4.

³ *Dit., op. cit.*, 327.

⁴ *Diod. xviii. 17. 6-7.*

The league
would appropriate
the machinery

wished to preserve its institutions and negotiate through it, while the most telling blow delivered by Antipater against Greek liberty consisted in his refusal to recognize the league and in his restoration of the old principle of particularism and the right of each state independently to determine its own course of action.

Antipater's determination to negotiate only with the individual states might be reconciled with the recognition of the right of the league to continue its activities. He might have held that the failure to recognize the hegemony of the successors of Alexander meant a violation of the constitution of the league, and that therefore each state that had taken part in the movement was liable to a trial for treason. This should have meant a trial before the synedrion of the league, a course that from his point of view was impossible, for the synedrion was, for the time being, controlled by rebels who were all equally implicated. Under the circumstances, he might have held that it was proper for the representative of the hegemon to take the power into his hands until the synedrion once more consisted of representatives loyal to the principles of the league. Such might have been his course if he had been friendly to the league idea. It is clear, however, that he was hostile to the league and to Greek liberty, that he ruled the country with an iron hand, and that the league cannot possibly have functioned between 322 and 319.

In the year 319, however, Polyperchon, in an effort to gain the support of Greece in his war against Cassander, revived the league by means of his famous decree issued in the name of Philip Arrhidaeus.¹ From the wording of this decree, it is seen both that the league had actually been prevented from functioning by Antipater,² and that at least for the time being the official interpretation was that the league had always been favored by the king and had never been discontin-

¹ This is clear from a comparison of Diod. xviii. 56 with xviii. 69. 3. The latter passage shows that Polyperchon actually called a meeting of the synedrion. This attempt to make the league function makes it clear that the reference in *ibid.* 56. 2 to a restoration of the peace means a restoration of the league which had as one of its central purposes the maintenance of peace between members. Also the expression *προσκατεῖν* . . . τῶν συμμάχων (*ibid.* 75. 2) is probably correctly interpreted by Droysen (*Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Vol. II [2d ed.], Part I, p. 227) as implying a revival of the league.

² Not mentioned by name. The reference is to "our generals."

ued.¹ The decree further implies that everything is to be regulated according to the rules laid down in the days of Philip and Alexander. This makes it unlikely that any new constitution was drawn up. Apparently, the old treaties of Philip still served as such, or if the renewing of the alliance necessitated new treaties, they must have been closely modeled on the earlier ones.

After Polyperchon's decree, it is well known that other Macedonian leaders in their turn issued decrees proclaiming the liberty of the Greeks. A similar proviso was also included in the treaty of peace of 311 between Antigonos and his opponents, Lysimachus, Cassander, and Ptolemy.² There is no indication that all decrees resulted in the revival of the league, but to many, the liberty of the Greeks must have meant the Hellenic league, for there must have been a large party opposed to a return to complete particularism, the only alternative form of liberty. Thus, the decrees, even if they did no more, kept alive the league idea, though few can have dreamt of a league as extensive as Philip's league had been. Then came the peace of 311, which served as a basis for the revival of the Hellenic league by Demetrius Poliorcetes already so often referred to. This league, too, must have been less extensive than its model, and, as it has been indicated above, probably represented less sincere effort and meant little more than an attempt to capitalize Greek desire for liberty and interest in the league for the purpose of the war against Cassander. The league thus revived, of course, collapsed with the power of Demetrius.

Next, in spite of great activity in lesser leagues, no Hellenic League is heard of for some time. Finally, in 223 one was organized by Antigonos Doson. Less is known about the machinery of this than of the earlier leagues. On account of the long period intervening and the

¹ Diod. xviii. 56. 3. The generals are blamed for the hardships of the Greeks. *ἡμεῖς δὲ τιμῶντες τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς προαίρεσιν κατασκευάζομεν ὑμῖν εἰρήνην*. Droysen (*Hellenismus*, Vol. II [2d ed.], Part I, p. 227, n. 1) considers the omission of the article before *συνέδριον* in Diod. xviii. 69. 3 as an indication that the synedrion was not looked upon as a continuation of the synedrion of the Corinthian league. Niese (*Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, Vol. I, p. 244, n. 5) does not think that the language of Diodorus is accurate enough to warrant this conclusion. He also considers the dissolution of the league unlikely, for the Macedonian control of Greece depended on it. In the judgment of the writer, the clearest proof that the revived league was represented as a continuation of the old Hellenic league is found in the expression quoted from the decree of 319.

² Diod. xix. 105. 1.

changed conditions in Greece, it is likely that while the broad outlines were copied from the earlier leagues, there were considerable changes in detail. In some cases, it is possible to point to specific similarities and differences.

Some of the similarities will be mentioned first. Recorded treaties¹ regulated the relation of the league members to the king, that is, served as constitution for the league. The Macedonian king was the hegemon of the league whose chief organ of government was the syndedrion. The careers of Antigonos Doson and Philip V indicate that the hegemon commanded the league army in a case of war. We also several times hear of him summoning meetings of the syndedrion, not always to the same place.² It is not known whether in selecting time and place for these meetings he was compelled to act in co-operation with any such board as the *proëdroi* or not. The fact that no *proëdroi* are mentioned certainly does not prove that they did not exist. In the syndedrion, the various members of the league were probably represented in proportion to their size, though no definite testimony on this point has been preserved.³

On the other hand, there are also several differences. These largely meant greater freedom for the members and less power for the hegemon and syndedrion. They are largely due to changed conditions in Greece, though the generosity of the character of Antigonos may also have contributed to the result. One innovation due entirely to the changed conditions was that there were no individual city-states among the members of the Hellenic league. The members were leagues, and real leagues, not groups of cities artificially joined together in the manner of the league of Philip II. The list of members included the Achaeans, the Epirotes, the Phocians, the Macedonians, the Boeotians, the Acarnanians, and the Thessalians.⁴ The inclusion of Macedonia is important and means a decided change from the earlier form of the Hellenic league. This might be used as an argument for the

¹ *ἑλληναῖος συμμαχία* (Pol. iv. 82. 5). The passage applies directly only to the relations of the Achaeans to Philip, but it is evident that if these relations were regulated by a treaty, there must have been similar treaties between Philip and the other members of the league.

² *Ibid.* iv. 22. 2; v. 28. 3; v. 102. 8.

³ Cf. Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, p. 243.

⁴ Pol. iv. 9. 4; iv. 15. 1; xi. 5 (6). 4.

increasing Hellenization of Macedonia, but the correct explanation is probably rather that Doson never so completely overshadowed Greece as Philip had done, and that, therefore, it was a real advantage to him to control as many votes as possible in the synedrion.

A second important difference is that resolutions of the synedrion, at least when they involved a declaration of war, required the approval of the members.¹ The explanation of this change is the strength of the Greek states of the time.² Philip II could impose his will on the Greeks as conqueror; in the days of Demetrius Poliorcetes, the Greeks had little to choose between except allegiance to one Macedonian leader or another; but in the days of Antigonos Doson, the position of the king was relatively weak, while Greek states were strong enough to be reckoned with. Therefore, it was impossible to impose upon them a stricter organization than was acceptable to the members.

This independence of the members of the league over against the central organization makes it all the more interesting to notice the restrictions placed upon them. Though there can have been no prohibition on having diplomatic intercourse with other Greek states, the permission of the hegemon was required before a new state could be admitted to the league.³ This might be taken for granted, for admission of a new member must have taken the form of a treaty to which the hegemon was a party. The freedom of diplomatic intercourse with Greek states, however, did not extend to kings. The Achaeans were forbidden to communicate with other kings without the approval of Antigonos,⁴ and it can, *a fortiore*, be assumed that the same rule applied to other members of the league. Then, too, the rule was, once a member, always a member, and a motion to secede was looked upon as treason.⁵

The last provision mentioned needs to be considered in relation to the rule requiring the approval of members for a declaration of war. The conjecture of Ferguson⁶ is probably correct that this meant the neutrality of the state that failed to ratify the declaration. This state, however, did not have the right to secede. The league thus amounted

¹ Pol. iv. 26. 1-2. For a discussion of the bearing of this requirement, see especially Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism*, pp. 244 f.

² Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, Vol. III (1st ed.), Part I, p. 737.

³ Pol. iv. 9. 3.

⁴ Plut. *Arat.* 45.

⁵ Livy xxxii. 22. 3.

⁶ *Greek Imperialism*, p. 244.

to little more than a military alliance in which the members were pledged to maintain peace with one another and co-operate in wars that won their approval. If, however, they failed to approve of the war in question, they were forbidden to secede and go over to the enemy.

In conclusion, an attempt will be made to summarize and evaluate the results arrived at. In the first place, it is now evident that representative institutions were known to the Greeks and continued to be a moot question for a considerable period. Therefore, when the Ancient World failed to evolve a representative system of government on a large scale, this cannot be attributed to ignorance of that form of government, but some other explanation must be sought. It is true that the institutions described in this study, according to the Greek point of view, belonged to the field of foreign affairs. It is clear, however, that the central authorities set up in the early Hellenic leagues were so strong that the government could easily have developed into that of a regular federal state. Though the members of the league were free and autonomous, when league interests required it, it seems, judging by the example of Corinth, that it was perfectly proper to place a foreign garrison in one of these free states. It was also proper for the central authorities to interfere in local affairs to prevent revolutions or other radical changes. Finally, in case of a conflict between the central and local authorities, at least, if the claim could be put forward that league interests were at stake, the constitution in every way favored the central government. When this is borne in mind, it is easy to believe that if the organization had continued to exist for some time, the Greeks might have developed the habit of thinking in terms of the league instead of in terms of the city-state. If this attitude only could have been developed, the machinery for a strong central government was already there. Events, however, were to show that the change could not be brought about without the presence of a strong power to maintain the league against particularistic tendencies. Even after the leagues of the third century had helped to decrease the particularism of the city-states, the particularism of the organizations that did exist was so strong that when the Hellenic league was revived by Antigonos Doson, it was transformed from an incipient federal government to an ordinary alliance.

purpose
* APX

* in league

* APX

Ev. *
Ev. / *

evaluation

The Hellenic league with a strong central government was imposed upon Greece by the will of the conqueror. It would, however, be extremely narrow to dismiss it with the remark that it was merely an instrument in the hands of the tyrant. On the other hand, Philip must be given credit for his very liberal and broad-minded treatment of the Greeks. Nor is it correct to say that he had no other alternative. It is probably true that the possibilities of the divine kingship had not yet been seen. It is also true that the Macedonians were not in a position to govern Greece bureaucratically. However, an alternative did exist in the shape of the method followed by the Persians when they imposed the King's Peace on Greece. He might have left the relation of Greece to himself indefinite and interfered when he considered it to his own interest. For this purpose, the Amphictyonic league might, at least at times, have served as an instrument. When instead he chose to define his relation to the Greeks by definite treaties, in some respects he was a gainer, but in many respects he was a loser, for he was now bound to act through the agency of the machinery of the league. Furthermore, as the events of the Lamian War were to show, he had given the Greeks an organization that could be utilized not only in the interests of the hegemon, but that also could be appropriated by his enemies and used against him. And, finally, it must be remembered that though the league at first depended on the Macedonian supremacy for its existence, an attempt was made to gain the good will of the Greeks so that its future would not depend on compulsion but on a feeling of solidarity between the members.

evaluation

In this way the Hellenistic age receives an added interest. It is seen that the form of government under which the Greek world was to be organized after the Macedonian conquest was not from the first a foregone conclusion. Instead there was, for a time, a contest between the Hellenic league and the divine monarchy. In this contest, the league was the first to be tried but was superseded by the other form by Alexander so soon that it is impossible to say whether it could have proved a practical success or not. It is possible that it might have worked over the area to which it was applied, namely, Greece proper, the Thracian coast, the Aegean Islands, and the Greek section of Asia Minor. On the other hand, it is also possible that even this involved too large an area to make representative government practical

in those days of poor means of communication. The question was left undecided, unless it be argued that Alexander abandoned the system because of its failure. It seems, however, rather to have been his imperial policies that caused its abandonment.

Two reasons for Alexander's action can be suggested: his policy of internationalism, and the impossibility of making the league function if it were extended over too great an area. It was not that it was impossible for the king to stand in different relations to different subjects. The Ptolemies later justified their rule by three different theories suited to three different groups of subjects.¹ But Alexander did not want a state of the Ptolemaic type, at least not in Asia, nor did he want a state in which the antagonism between Greeks and barbarians was emphasized. From his point of view, this was precisely what was wrong with the Hellenic league. It was a Greek ethnic state writ large, appealed to Panhellenic patriotism, and had had as its first great undertaking the national war against Persia. To one who wished to fuse Greek and Asiatic, it cannot have seemed well to give such an institution first place in his empire. In the second place, if the Hellenic league was to have continued as an important instrument for government, and if it was to have been what it claimed to be, a league for all Greeks, it would have been necessary to have included all Greek cities founded by Alexander. It is possible to believe that the league might have functioned successfully in the Aegean area, but it certainly never could have functioned if cities as far away as Central Asia and India were included. When the league was revived later by others, there was no thought of extending it over this whole area.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

¹ Ferguson, *op. cit.*, pp. 162 f.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE CONSTITUTION OF THERAMENES

The constitution of Athens during the eight months that followed the overthrow of the Four Hundred in September, 411 B.C., is described by Thucydides (viii. 97. 2) as "a judicious blend of the few and the many that raised the state from the evil plight into which it had fallen"; it was the best constitution, he thought, Athens had had up to his time—a judgment with which Aristotle (*Constitution of Athens*, 33. 2) is in substantial agreement.

It is assumed that we do not know what this much praised constitution was (Ed. Meyer, Busolt, Bury, Botsford, etc.). This is a misapprehension. It is in fact the constitution of the Five Thousand, sketched from an official document in Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens*, 30. There it appears in conjunction with the alleged constitution of the Four Hundred as part of the program enacted, ostensibly, on the 14th of Thargelion (April-May), 411 B.C., on the creation of the oligarchy. The difficulties of this attribution are well known, and need not concern us here. They have led Beloch (*Griech. Gesch.*, II, 2, 311 ff.; cf. also Lenschau, *Rh. Mus.*, LXVIII, 202 ff.) to regard the constitution of the Four Hundred (the one inaugurated *ἐν τῇ παρόντι καιρῷ*, according to Aristotle) and the constitution of the Five Thousand (proposed *εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον*) as one and the same, erroneously divided in two and assigned to the wrong epoch by Aristotle—to April-May, 411 B.C., instead of four months later. Of the fact that the two cannot be combined to form a single instrument of government Beloch's attempt to show that they can is ample demonstration. Even granted that what he finds in the text can be read into it—an inadmissible concession—to organize the whole citizen body into four sections, or, indeed, to organize it at all, for any object such organization serves in his construction, was to use a sledge to kill flies. Outside the Four Hundred the sections are an encumbrance. Just why quarters should have been organized inside it, in addition to the tenths already existent, is not apparent. Besides, the power conferred upon the Four Hundred is incompatible with the sovereignty of the Five Thousand—Theramenes' conception. *Ἄπαντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῶν ἂν ἔπραξαν, οὐδὲν ἐπαναφέροντες τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις.*

Nor are we helped by accepting Caspari's elaboration of Beloch's idea. Caspari (*JHS*, XXXIII, 15 ff.) agrees as to the misplacing of the two constitutions by Aristotle; but he keeps them separate, and conceives of Athens as governed after the fall of the Four Hundred by another Four Hundred designated and ruling according to the terms of the constitution *ἐν τῇ παρόντι*

καιρῷ. "The 'definite' constitution," he concludes, "was never put into operation, or only for a very short time." And if his view is otherwise correct, his conclusion as to this constitution having been inoperative is inevitable, since therein it is provided that ten generals, to be selected by the Four Hundred, are to serve for the coming year (ἀρχεῖν τὸν εἰσιόντα ἐνιαυτόν), i.e., for the year 410-409 B.C., and with unlimited authority at that (αὐτοκράτορας), consulting the Four Hundred only when they have need (κὰν τι δέωνται συμβουλευέσθαι μετὰ τῆς βουλῆς). That is to say, the Five Thousand could not have taken charge before twenty months after the fall of the Four Hundred, if then. This offends not only against all probabilities, but against the unequivocal report of both Thucydides (viii. 97. 1) and Aristotle (33. 1) to the effect that it was to the Five Thousand that the government was intrusted after the defeat of Eretria. There is, moreover (*pace* Caspari), not the remotest parallel between this indefinite delegation of great power to a second Four Hundred and the appointment of a committee of twenty, expressly subordinated to the democratic constitution, to hold the elections of councillors and nomothetae after the reconciliation of the two factions in 403 B.C. It is the part alone of the program which was drawn up "for the future" that was given effect to on the triumph of Theramenes and the moderates.

Recognition of this fact, which seems so plain as hardly to require an argument, has been impeded in the first place by Aristotle's mention of the program for the future as a program alone, and in the second place by incredulity as to the capacity of the constitution of the program to exist anywhere except on paper. Ed. Meyer calls it "die vollste Utopie" (*Gesch. d. Alt.*, IV, 591), Wilamowitz, "ein schlechthin lebensunfähiges ding" (*Aristoteles u. Athen*, II, 116), Busolt, "blosser Entwurf" (*Griech. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1489). Yet one by one facts have come to light which tend to give to the program less of the character of a theoretical construction and to tie it down more and more to actuality. The Boeotian cities were found to have the division of citizens into four Councils, successively active, which was thought to be its most impractical feature (Köhler, *Sitz. Berl. Akad.*, 1895, pp. 455 ff.; 1900, p. 816; *Hellen. Oxyrh.* 11, 2); and what worked satisfactorily for sixty years in Thebes could hardly be thought of, despite Ed. Meyer, as utterly anachronistic in contemporary Athens. Then Wilhelm (see *Jahresh. d. österr. arch. Inst.*, 1924, p. 147 = *IG*, II², 12 = *IG*, I², 297; cited hereafter as Decree W) succeeded in finding an Athenian decree passed during the régime of the Five Thousand from which it appeared that the five *proedroi*, to whom the program intrusted the conduct of meetings of the Council of the Five Thousand, actually existed between September, 411, and May, 410 B.C. Ed. Meyer noted, further, that the transfer of the city treasury from the *kolakretae* to the *Hellenotamiae* contemplated in the program really occurred (*Forsch. z. alt. Gesch.*, II, 137; *Gesch. d. Alt.*, IV, 590). These observations, however, were interpreted as indications, not that the program in its entirety was put into operation in September,

411 B.C., but that these particulars alone were adopted from it (see Busolt, *Griech. Staatskunde*, pp. 73 ff., 630d, e).

But four points of contact between the program and the actual government of the Five Thousand can be added to those already noted, and cumulatively they imply the existence of the program in all its essential features.

1. The appearance in Decree W and in the decree formulating the indictment against Antiphon ([Plut.] v, x or., 833d=IG, I², 298; cited hereafter as Decree A)—the only other decree of the Five Thousand extant—of the Council acting as Council and Assembly. On this point see, for Decree W, v. Hartel, *Studien über attische Staatsrecht u. Urkundenwesen*, pp. 159 f., and Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, p. 149; for Decree A, Lipsius, *Das attische Recht*, pp. 184, 206, and Thalheim, *Pauly-Wissowa*, V, 2, 2140.

2. The taking of the chairman and the secretary of the Council from the same tribe in Decree A, as permitted under the constitution of the program (where the former was chosen from the officiating Council, the latter from outside it, but both electorates contained individuals from all ten tribes). Under the democratic constitution the chairman belonged to the officiating prytany, the secretary to some one or other of the other nine prytanies (see, e.g., Brillant, *Les secrétaires athéniens*, p. 22, n. 2). For Οἱ[ἐθεν] in IG, I², 109, *Ο[τρυνεύς] should probably be restored, thus doing away with the only remaining exception.

3. The omission of -- ἰς ἐπρυτάνει in the preamble of both Decree W (Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, p. 149) and Decree A (Blass, *Antiphontis Orationes*², p. xxxvii, and IG, I², 298, col. 1, n. 1). That the two decrees are alike in this particular, as in the absence of all mention of the *demos* (above, 1), excludes the suggestion of Wilhelm that we have to do merely with an inadvertence of a copyist. As sketched by Aristotle the constitution of the program contains no mention of prytanies; and for the purposes of our argument we might leave it at that. But we can be sure that in the intervals between the sessions of the Council, which were held only once every five days, some sort of a fraction of the Council met to conduct public business. Such was the case even with the Four Hundred (*Thucy.* viii. 70. 1); and in the *Constitution of Athens* (30. 4) there is in fact a passage that is ordinarily misunderstood or amended which calls for the breaking up of the Council into sections: κληροῦν δὲ τὴν βουλὴν τοὺς ἐννέα ἄρχοντας. This must be translated: "The nine archons are to apply the lot to the Council," i.e., to use the lot to determine its sections and their order of precedence. And in this same sense precisely Aristotle uses the word κληροῦν in the very next paragraph: κληροῦν δὲ τοὺς λαχόντας πέντε τοὺς ἐθέλοντας προσελθεῖν ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς: "The five *proedroi* are to use the lot to separate the individuals wishing to appear before the Council and determine their order of precedence." The section of the Council, or quasi-prytany—in Decree A it is named simply prytany—may be assumed to have been, not the delegation of a single tribe, but a fair sample of the officiating Council, like the Council of the *demos* of the Five Hundred

which it replaced. That this was actually the case in September, 411, to May, 410, is shown by the fact that the five *proedroi* in Decree W, who are clearly the chairmen of the quasi-prytany for the five days between meetings of the Council, are taken from different tribes, one, e.g., from Xypete (Kekropis) and another from Kephale (Akamantis). Hence the quasi-prytany could not be designated by the name of a tribe. For this reason, as well as on account of the reappearance of *demos* in its preamble, IG, I², 105, a decree passed in the archonship of Theopompos (September, 411, to end of official year 411-410 B.C.) can be dated only after the restoration of unrestricted democracy in or about the month of May, 410 B.C.—as assumed by Wilhelm (*op. cit.*, p. 144).

4. The transfer, provided in the program, of the custody of the treasures of the Other Gods to the Treasurers of Athena, attested in and after 406-405 B.C. (when the treasures of Athena, being put almost entirely into the melting pot to finance Arginusae, became the lesser part of the responsibility of these officials) by the change of their name to Treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods. See *Cornell Studies*, VII, 72, where, however, the significance of the new title is misunderstood.

It should finally be recalled that in the decree of the first prytany of 410-409 B.C. quoted by Andocides i. 96, the designation of the Council as ἡ βουλὴ οἱ πεντακόσιοι λαχόντες τῷ κνᾶμφ implies, not only that the preceding Council was not elected by lot (Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, IV, 600; cf. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, 2, 314), but equally that its number was not five hundred.

For the bearing of the identification here proposed on the history of Athenian government during this period a reference may be given to chapter x of the forthcoming fifth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

W. S. FERGUSON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

BONUM FACTUM, BONA FIDE, AND BONA FORTUNA

In annotated textbook or *inscriptionum collectio*, scholars, commenting on *bonum factum* (often abbreviated *B.F.*), have been content to say that it is a formula placed at the beginning of edicts.¹ A statement of this sort, while not incorrect, is liable to give the impression that, when *bonum factum* is used, it must stand at the very beginning of the edict without any introductory words preceding it—a view that is quite untenable, and one, too, that is clearly contrary to that of the authorities quoted above.² This wrong im-

¹ Dessau, *Insc. Lat.* II, 2, 8208, footnote 3, "sic praescribi solitum edictis"; Mommsen, *Eph. Epigr.*, VIII, 255, "Idem exordium est in edicto praetoris urbani *CIL*, VI, 31614-15"; Rolfe (Suetonius, *Caes.* 80), "a formula prefixed to edicts"; etc.

² Dessau, e.g., is commenting on an inscription in which *B.F.* begins the fourth line.

pression appears in a remark by Professor D. M. Robinson,¹ who rejects *bonum factum* as a possible reading for *B.F.*, because it "was used only at the beginning of edicts." In his inscription *B.F.* (l. 11) follows a *cum*-circumstantial clause.

Important evidence for our information about *bonum factum* is found in *CIL*, 31614, 31615, 32323 (l. 80), where it seems to be the unquestioned reading for *B.F.*² The chief points to be noted are that *B.F.* is not at the very beginning of the inscriptions, and that *B* is placed in the margin (so far at least as the line above and below is concerned). The literary evidence, though restricted to quasi-edicts,³ naturally preserves much of the form of the *edicta praeioris*. No reason, however, can be adduced from this source for holding that *B.F.* must stand first. In fact, in only one instance⁴ does this seem to be the case. But it can be said of every edict that is sufficiently preserved for us in literature or inscriptions—including the one in Suetonius just mentioned—that *B.F.*, or *bonum factum*, when occurring, stands immediately before the edict proper, i.e., just before the statement of things commanded or prohibited. In *CIL*, VI, 31614–15 (Suet. *Caes.* 80; *Vit.* 14), the word that immediately follows *bonum factum* is *ne*, introducing the prohibition. If, however, there is any need of introductory words or a statement of the circumstances leading up to the particular action taken in the edict, these regularly precede *B.F.*, and the *B*, apparently, is placed in the margin to indicate clearly that the edict proper begins here.

Applying these deductions to Professor Robinson's edict, we are forced to conclude, not merely that *bonum factum* cannot be eliminated for the reason he gives, but also that, if it were used in this edict, the most probable place would be just where the letters *B.F.* (or *B.E.*) occur. The position of *bonum factum* in Suet. *Vit.* 14 assures us that in the edict under consideration it would not precede *dicit* at the end of line 3. Moreover, since *B.F.*, with *B* in the margin, introduces the edict proper and follows the *cum*-clause, which states the circumstances that gave rise to the proclamation, room is left for no valid objection to the conjectural reading of *bonum factum* for *B.F.*

But before deciding finally on this emendation, two other expressions, *bona fide* and *bona fortuna*, should be considered. In favor of *bona fide*, for which the letters *B.F.* are also used in edicts,⁵ is the fact that its meaning is quite in harmony with the context. The people of Antioch are ordered to make a declaration of the amount of grain each has and the portion of this

¹ "An Edict from Pisidian Antioch," *TAPA*, LV (1924), 19.

² Cf. *Isid. Orig.* i. 22; *Prob. Litt. Sing. Gramm.* iv. 274; *Not. Latere. Gramm.* iv. 282 b 1, 305 b 6; *Tert. Pudic.* 1.

³ Cf. Mommsen's *Iudicaria popularia* in *Bruns, Fontes*, V, 171.

⁴ Suet. *Caes.* 80, "Libellus propositus est: 'Bonum factum: ne quis senatori novo curiam monstrare velit!'"

⁵ *Not. Latere. Gramm.* iv. 289 b 8, 317 b 22; *Paul. Dig.* xvii. 2. 3. 3; *Edict. Ulp. Dig.* vi. 2. 7. 11; etc.

that each will need for his own *familia*. Since the effectiveness of the decree depends very largely upon the honesty of the *coloni* and *incolae*, it would not be surprising to find *bona fide* used in such an edict. In line 27 the matter of cheating and its penalty are expressly referred to: "Quod si quis non paruerit [i.e., if anyone does not make his declaration *bona fide*], sciat me, quidquid contra edictum meum retentum fuerit, in commissum vindicaturum, etc." Attractive though it is, this conjecture has several obstacles that must be faced. Apparently, the abbreviation of *B.F.* for *bona fide* is not used in inscriptions, although the expression itself occurs in the graffiti at Pompeii. Then, too, if *bona fide* were the reading, the prominent place assigned to it and the position of *B* in the margin could not be easily explained. Furthermore, *bona fide* would add to the edict no idea or force not already present in the words that follow.

As for *bona fortuna*, it is ruled out by the following considerations. The *B.F.* which stands for *bona fortuna* in inscriptions invariably comes at the beginning, occupying the middle of the first line by itself, usually with a few spaces between the letters.¹ In no case does it introduce an edict.

For Professor Robinson's reading, *bono tempore*, there is no precedent except the *tempore bono* which occurs at the beginning of a Moesian inscription,² found in *vineae inter rudera sepulcrorum*, and which is followed by the words, *pro salute dominorum*, etc.—scarcely a convincing or applicable example. But even if it were altogether applicable to his inscription, *B.T.E.* as an abbreviation for *bono tempore* is unexampled, and *bono tempore* is of too rare occurrence to admit of being represented in this way. *E*, moreover, if the evidence of the photographs is to be relied upon, turns out to be merely an *F*, especially when we compare it with the *F* of *frumenti* in line 8 (Pl. III). What appears to be the lowest horizontal of an *E* is really the continuation of a curved mark on the stone, a blemish similar to that which cuts through the *C* of *coloni* in the line below (12).

We must submit, then, that the reading from line 11 should be:

B(onum) f(actum): omnes, qui Ant(iochensis) col(oniae)
aut coloni aut incolae sunt,
profiteantur apud II viros col(oniae) Antiochensis, etc.

HOMER F. REBERT

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

A NOTE ON LATIN VERBS OF ACQUISITION

English "get," "receive," is expressed in Latin by *accipere* or *ferre*; however, in at least two passages, Val. Fl. 2. 306 and Tac. A. 6. 40, the latter verb seems to denote "gain, win," synonyms of "get" for which there are many Latin renderings. Exceptional are preterite forms of verbs of finding:

¹ *CIL*, III, 249, 251, 316, 347, 383, 6058, 6900, 13704; *ibid.*, VI, 406.

² *Ibid.*, 13747.

repperi Ter. Haut. 112, invenit Cic. Off. 3. 112, inventus, *ibid.* 84, Hor. A.P. 170, Ov. Am. 3. 8. 54; much commoner those of *quaerere*: the perfect Sall. Iug. 85. 30, Tac. A. 2. 62 and 14. 55; the pluperfect Cic. Clu. 71, Leg. Agr. 3. 12, Hor. Ep. 1. 15. 32, Ov. Met. 6. 12, Tac. A. 12. 36, 13. 15, H. 3. 60; the perfect participle Sall. Or. Lep. 22, *ibid.* 26, Ep. Pomp. 1, Hor. C. 3. 30. 15, S. 1. 1. 38, 2. 6. 82, Ov. Am. 3. 8. 20, *ibid.* 66, Met. 7. 657, Plin. N.H. 21. 7, Sen. Ep. 68. 11, Sil. 15. 16, Tac. A. 13. 42, 15. 41, H. 1. 30, *ibid.* 83; and probably in Lucr. 5. 5. and Cic. Planc. 66 *parata* and *quaesita* are to be regarded as synonyms. That the present of *quaerere* might be taken in the same sense, is to be inferred from *acquirere*; and examples of this use of the simple verb seem to be found in Cic. Att. 1. 12. 3, Sall. Iug. 87. 2, and Hor. Ep. 1. 7. 57 (cf. S. 1. 1. 37 f.). I feel more doubt concerning Cic. Leg. Agr. 3. 15, although *quaeratur* here corresponds to *comparetur* and *paretur*, *ibid.* 2. 85; but only an intention to get exists, and this conception, implied in 2:85 by the tense, is perhaps more fully expressed in 3. 15 by the use of a verb which may in itself signify only "try to get." In Liv. 37. 54. 16 *parare et quaerere* may be either pleonasm or hysteron proteron; the latter is suggested by the comparison of Rh. ad Her. 3. 38, *ut ne quid ipse quaerat, nos illi omnia parata quaesitaque tradamus*. Still, this is not conclusive; the verb may here change its sense with the shift from present to past; cf. Cic. Sull. 73, *haec diu multumque ac multo labore quaesita una eripuit hora*, where the adverbs give to the participle the meaning "striven for" (cf. Stat. S. 1. 2. 275), while with *eripuit* it slides over into "acquired." On Sall. Iug. 3. 3, *neque aliud se fatigando nisi odium quaerere*, Kritiz paraphrases by *quaerendo consequi*, *parare*, Jakobs-Wirz by *mit dem klaren Bewusstsein dass man nur Hass ernten werde, dennoch auf dieses Ziel losgehen*; that Kritiz's view is correct, seems proved by the preceding *frustra niti*, which implies that the result attained is not that which was sought.

The *Thesaurus* affords material for the study of *acquirere*, *conciliare*, *apisci*, *adipisci*, *adsequi*, and *consequi*. The four deponents are distinguished from a fifth, *nancisci*, by the fact that they do not, as it may, express the happening upon a thing by chance; they are distinguished from *acquirere*, *conciliare*, *parere*, *parare*, and *comparare* by the fact that they denote only acquisition for one's self, while the five active verbs may be used also of acquisition for another, and may accordingly not only be accompanied by a dative of advantage (*sibi*, *alteri*) but also have an abstract noun as subject. This latter use I have noticed with a deponent only in Cic. Caec. 35, *actio iniuriarum non ius possessionis adsequitur sed . . . dolorem mitigat*; contrast *ibid.* 32, *per hoc interdictum adsequi*. Another distinction is found in the fact that *adipisci*, *adsequi*, and *consequi* frequently take as objects a clause of result; the only instance that I have noted of this with an active verb is the consecutive infinitive in Sil. 4. 47, *sedesque beatas et metui peperere manu*.

In two passages two of these active verbs are used interchangeably: Sall. Iug. 10. 4, *amici quos neque armis cogere neque auro parare queas; officio et fide pariuntur*, and Tac. G. 14, *iners videtur sudore acquirere quod possis sanguine parare*. The first is to be remarked because *amicum parare* is the usual

phrase, see *Thesaurus*. I, 1907, 5, citing for *a. parere* only this passage and Ter. *Eun.* 149, to which add *Andr.* 68 (but *ibid.* 66 *parare*). The other is noteworthy, because, of these two cognates, *parere* is much commoner than *parare* when the means of acquisition is toil, valor, warfare. The reason is, no doubt, that *parare* and *comparare* are often used with the expression or implication of a price and so are virtually equivalent to *emere* (the three together of the same transaction in Cic. *Sull.* 54 f.). We need not render them by "buy" since English "acquire" and "get" are used in the same way; "purchase" is admissible, in view of its earlier and legal uses, though its semantic development is that of *quaerere*.

Of ablatives or prepositional phrases expressing a toilsome or violent mode of acquisition (*labore*, *virtute*, *sanguine*, and the like) I have noted, with *parere*, forty-nine instances; with *parare*, besides Tac. *loc. cit.* *G.* 14 only Hor. *S.* 2. 3. 98, Tibull. 2. 4. 21, Stat. *S.* 3. 1. 29, and Sil. 15. 495; ablatives expressing neither this notion nor that of price occur in Pl. *Men.* 584 (*iniuriis*, contrast Cic. *Fin.* 1. 53, *Rep.* 3. 26), Nep. 25. 13. 4, and Prop. 1. 8. 36. Four of these passages exhibit the participle *paratus* which is used also in Cic. *Cael.* 3. 38, *ibid.* 61, Hor. *C.* 1. 31. 7, Sen. *Clem.* 1. 9. 4, *Ben.* 1. 11. 5, Quintil. 11. 1. 1, and Tac. *A.* 4. 44. But these instances of *paratus* "got" are few in comparison with those of *partus*, which amount to 201 out of the 261 examples I have collected of *parere* "get." I do not offer these figures as unquestionable; there may be other instances of variants or emendation than those known to me—Pl. *Truc.* 62, Liv. 5. 1. 1, Cic. *Mur.* 55 (see Mueller adn. cr.), Tac. *H.* 5. 10, *ibid.* 24; but the general predominance in this sense of *partus*, recognized by Professor Moore in his note on Hor. *C.* 1. 31. 7 is beyond doubt. The reason, of course, was the large use of *paratus* in the sense of "ready"; the effect was to make *partus* the participle of *parare* "get," as well as of *parere*; cf. *B. Afr.* 47. 4, Sall. *Iug.* 31. 17.

My collection of the forms of these two verbs, though incomplete, is perhaps large enough to permit some observations on their distribution. In the present infinitive *parare* is usual; it alone is used in the passive, and of the active I have twenty-four instances against three of *parere*, Ter. *Andr.* 797, *Eun.* 149, Tac. *D.* 5. (Baiter and Kayser, indeed, have *parere* in Cic. *Lael.* 54; but all other editions that I have been able to consult give *parare*, with no hint of a variant.) Of both verbs the finite tenses from the present stem are used freely in the Ciceronian period, while later those of *parare* seem to predominate, the only exception that I have noted being *pariatur* in Liv. 7. 40. 5 and Sil. 5. 169. As to tenses from the perfect stem, I have thirty-nine instances of *peperi*, etc., against nineteen of *paravi*; the former seems to be rare in Silver Latin (Vell. 2. 120. 4, Val. M. 2. 7. 2, 2. 8. pr., 5. 4. ext. 3, Sil. 4. 47, Tac. *A.* 4. 35, *H.* 1. 37, are my only instances); the latter I have not observed in Cicero or Caesar, but it is used by Sallust and the author of the *Bellum Africum*. Of gerundival forms I have noted the following: *parere* Cic. *Fin.* 1. 66, *Fam.* 10. 6. 1, Liv. 5. 44. 3; *parare* Cic. *Off.* 1. 17, Sall. *Or. Lep.* 7, Tibull. 2. 4. 21, Sen. *Ep.* 36. 4, Tac. *A.* 4. 1, *H.* 3. 15; the future participle only Sil. 9. 350.

I have, of course, not included in my count passages where it has seemed

to me that we should rather render the verbs by "beget," "create," or "make," though in some of these (e.g., Pl. *Merc.* 72, *Poen.* 211) the Romans may have regarded the matter differently; often, however, they must have recognized the shift of sense. Whether this shift, in *parere* and English "beget," arises from the use of those verbs to denote sexual creation, is an interesting question; two considerations suggest that on the contrary the sexual use arose out of the general sense of "create." The first (for the Latin) is that *parare* and its compounds, which have no sexual connotation, may denote creation. For *comparare* see *Thesaurus*, s.v.; for *reparare*, see Lewis and Short who give the two significations, *recuperare* and *reficere*, but muddle up the examples; for *parare* cf. *Lucr.* 1. 199, 4. 785, 5. 156, *ibid.* 198, *Ov. Am.* 2. 14. 12, *A.A.* 1. 237, *Tac. A.* 3. 27. The second is the inverse development from "create" to "get" of German *schaffen*, of English "make" in "make money," and of Latin *facere* in *facere pecuniam* *Cic. de Div.* 1. 111, *rem* *Hor. Ep.* 1. 1. 65, *divitias* *Sen. Ep.* 87. 3 (other examples in *Thesaurus* vi. 94, 32 f.).

For the shift from "get" to "prepare" in *parare* we have an English parallel in "get a meal" used of the cook—perhaps an Americanism, for I find it familiar to my students, who only on second thought recall the sense "take a meal," which alone is recognized in the *New English Dictionary*. "Get up" for "prepare" is, of course, used with more varied objects; in like manner *schaffen* shows its secondary sense of "get" chiefly in composition with *an* and *ver*.

For *parta* in *Aen.* 2. 784 Servius and Donatus give two explanations, either *parata* or *armis* (or *labore alieno*) *adquisita*, of which the second is obviously impossible; on *Buc.* 3. 68 Servius interprets *parta* by *praeparata*. The interpretation is, for that passage, not absolutely necessary; it is perhaps natural to speak confidently of a thing as "got," on which one can put one's hand. But it is natural only in the mouth of him who intends to acquire; accordingly I cannot follow Conington in so explaining *Aen.* 2. 784. Of the passages he cites only *Aen.* 6. 89 (his note on which shows great uncertainty) seems to me certainly parallel; it contains a threat, 2. 784 a promise, of that which awaits the person addressed; and *Tibull.* 2. 4. 1 is a good parallel in form and meaning. *Parere* and *parare* are so closely interlocked that it is not surprising if Virgil chose—perhaps more for the sake of an unusual, and therefore poetic, phrase than for metrical convenience—to employ *partus* in the signification usually appropriated to *paratus*.

W. H. KIRK

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

NOTE ON THE EUDEMIAN ETHICS, 1247b6

διὸ καὶ ὁρμίζοντο τὴν τύχην τιθέασιν αἰτίαν ἀλογον ἀνθρωπίνῃ λογισμῷ, ὡς οὐσης τινὸς φύσεως.

The manuscripts vary between ἀλογον and ἀνάλογον, and editors are in doubt. It would seem that somebody must have suggested ἀδηλον, but on a slight search I cannot find that anybody has. It is obviously the better read-

ing. The resultant definition was a commonplace in antiquity. Cf. Aetius, *Placita*, I. 29. 7 in Diel's *Doxographi*, p. 326:

'Αναξαγόρας καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ ἄδηλον αἰτίαν ἀνθρωπίνῃ λογισμῷ.

Simplicius in *Phys.* 333, 1 ff., has ἄδηλον . . . ἀνθρωπίνῃ διανοίᾳ. Alexander *De Anima Libri Mantissa*, p. 179, 6, Bruns, seems to object to the final phrase in the passage quoted from Eudemus above. After quoting the definition he adds that it does not imply φύσιν τινὰ τύχης, but that "chance" consists in a certain relation ποιᾶ σχέσει of men (i.e., their minds) to the cause. But that is a logomachy. Eudemus' phrase only means that what men call "chance" is an unknown cause but a real one, and hence an existent nature. Cicero understands the matter perfectly: cum enim nihil sine causa fiat; hoc ipsum est fortunae . . . obscura causa. (*Topica* 17). For the rest, the reading ἄλογον is not inconceivable but remains extremely improbable until a good parallel can be found for it in this use with the dative.

PAUL SHOREY

MODAL SUGGESTION OF THE LATIN IMPERFECT

Out of the normal function of the imperfect as the tense of progressive past action certain implications seem to arise. Thus, with a negative, the imperfect not infrequently appears to intimate that a thing could not happen, though strictly it states nothing more than that the thing did not happen, or was not happening; e.g., Cicero *Cato M.* 79: *nec enim, dum eram vobiscum, animum meum videbatis*. Ovid *Met.* ii. 21 ff.:

Protinus ad patrios sua fert vestigia vultus,
Constititque procul: neque enim propiora ferebat
Lumina.

In passages of this sort, the late-born reader instinctively feels that something more is involved than mere denial of a progressive past activity. The first example is a part of the discussion of the immortality of the soul, wherein the elder Cyrus, on his deathbed, points out to his sons that the invisibility of his soul after death means nothing, for they could not see it, either, when he was in the body.

The other passage has to do with the approach of Phaethon to his father, the sun. The closing phrase is an explanation (note *enim*); Phaethon stopped at a distance, because he could not bear the light at any closer range. To offer the information simply that he stopped at a distance, because he was not bearing the light at closer range would be suggestive of the feeble wit of the prologist in some early comedy.

It would seem, therefore, that the ancients, too, must have been conscious of the implication of these progressive imperfects, at any rate in certain cases. It is the chief purpose of this note to point out that modal implication lurks also in the use of the present indicative, and that here perhaps is an even better test of Roman feeling on the subject; e.g., Martial xii. 23:

Dentibus atque comis, nec te pudet, uteris emptis.
Quid facies oculo, Laelia? Non *emilur*.

These words are written at the expense of some woman who lacks an eye, and who tries to cover up other blemishes by the use of false teeth and hair. These last are easily available; an eye cannot be bought.

Such pregnant use of the present indicative finds rather close parallels in English, as when a person who proposes something outside the proprieties is informed: "That's not done here."

H. C. NUTTING

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CP. XX, 143. In connection with the first vowel of *φλήτης*, etc., my attention has been called to the note of Maas, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1912, 1076, which I had overlooked, and where the priority of the *ι* is also supported. I had also failed to notice that Schwyzler in his Index correctly sets up the feminine *φιλητία*, and that under *παρίσκεσις* he has "*sitne párskeσις = περίσκεψις?*"

On page 142 the reference *Ber. Berl. Akad.* should be *Anz. Wien. Akad.*

C. D. B.

YALE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL

STERLING FELLOWSHIPS FOR RESEARCH IN THE HUMANISTIC STUDIES AND THE NATURAL SCIENCES

The Sterling Fellowships have been established by a gift of one million dollars from the trustees of the estate of the late John W. Sterling to stimulate scholarship and advanced research in all fields of knowledge. They are open equally to graduates of Yale University and other approved colleges and universities in the United States and foreign countries, to both men and women, whether graduate students, or instructors or professors when on leave of absence, who desire to carry on studies and investigations under the direction of the Graduate Faculty of Yale University or in affiliation with that body. The Sterling Fellowships are awarded on the understanding that the recipients shall not engage in teaching during the tenure of appointment.

The stipends of the Research or Senior Fellowships range from \$1,000 to \$2,500 or more, dependent upon the character of the proposed investigation. The stipends of the Junior Fellowships range from \$1,000 to \$1,500. For special purposes, such as carrying through to completion a piece of investigation, awards may be made of less than \$1,000. Fellows who have not yet obtained the Ph.D. degree are subject to the usual tuition and laboratory fees. All Fellows are appointed for a single year, but may be reappointed with or without additional stipend.

Applications for these fellowships should be addressed to the Dean of the Graduate School of Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, on blanks which may be obtained from him. Applications for the Junior Fellowships must be submitted by March 1, and applications for the Senior Fellowships by April 1.

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Greek Religion. By MARTIN P. NILSSON. Translated from the Swedish by F. J. Fielden. With a Preface by Sir James G. Frazer. Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925. \$4.25.

The Religious Thought of the Greeks from Homer to the Triumph of Christianity. By CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE. Second edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925. \$4.00.

Professor Nilsson has long been known to students of Greek religion as the author of *Griechische Feste mit religiöser Bedeutung*, the most useful book in its field, as well as of several other important monographs and many short papers. The present work is especially welcome as a summing up of the author's views, and as a survey of Greek religious development from pre-historic times to the decadence.

The title of the book is perhaps a little misleading. It is a reworking of a series of lectures on the history of Greek religion, and, probably because of that circumstance, it is not really a documented history—it rarely cites ancient authorities, literary or epigraphic, although the author makes acknowledgments to many modern investigators. The beautifully printed pages gain in appearance by the sparsity of references; but because of the lack of them, many of Mr. Nilsson's conclusions can be tested only by a specialist who controls the authorities as well as the writer himself. An appendix of twenty pages or thereabouts would have been enough to remedy this fault; and many readers will hope to see the defect supplied in another edition.

For all that, the book is by far the most stimulating and interesting that is available for the student. Particularly valuable is the first chapter, on "Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion." The next three, "Origin of Greek Mythology," "Primitive Belief and Ritual," and "Gods of Nature and of Human Life," are marked by a virtue that deserves all praise, namely, openmindedness toward the contributions of anthropology and comparative religion, coupled with a sane discrimination between what is sound and what is fanciful. In the account of "Homeric Anthropomorphism and Rationalism" the reviewer misses only a little more attention to the note of aristocratic sophistication, verging upon cynicism, which seems best to explain some peculiar passages in the epic. There are many original views which deserve attention in the remaining chapters, "Legalism and Mysticism,"

"The Civic Religion," and "The Religion of the Cultured Classes and the Religion of the Peasants," the last of which gives a vivid picture of the decay of the old worship. But it is scarcely worth while to particularize; the whole book is good, and for the serious student of the subject it is indispensable.

Readers will naturally dissent from some of the author's opinions. Whatever may be true of the Oedipus of the folktale, not all will agree that the sufferings of Sophocles' Oedipus befell him "through no fault of his own" (p. 226); and the reviewer inclines to a somewhat different theory of certain votive offerings (p. 96). But these are small matters, and detract nothing from the general impression of able and honest interpretation which the book produces.

The translation is excellent. Only rarely (e.g., at the bottom of p. 215) do we find an awkward or foreign-sounding turn of expression. Misprints are even harder to find; on page 95 *site* should be *rite*.

The second edition of Professor C. H. Moore's *Religious Thought of the Greeks* is a reprint, in larger format, of the first (his Lowell Lectures, with some added material), with a few corrections and modifications of certain statements. Even the bibliography at the end remains substantially the same in spite of the lapse of eight years between the two printings. The references to encyclopedic works have been brought down to date, but very few additions, if any, have been made. However, the author had limited his study to the higher expressions of Greek religious thought, which have been least touched by the results of recent investigations; and his lucid résumé still remains a most useful aid to the student. There is, therefore, little to criticize. It may be regretted that the personal turns of expression which are a part of the lecturer's method have been allowed to stand in this second edition—Professor Nilsson's book follows a better plan in this respect: and one reader, at least, confesses to entertaining the perhaps ungracious, yet irrepressible, wish that Professor Moore had found time to give us a new book rather than a reprint of the old one.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

M. Tulli Ciceronis De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri I, II.
 Edited by J. S. REID. Cambridge University Press, 1925. Pp.
 viii+240. 16s.

Among English students of Cicero's philosophical works the outstanding position has long been occupied by Professor J. S. Reid, and it is consequently a cause for rejoicing that his labors upon the *De Finibus*, of which he published a translation in 1883, are at last continued by this important edition of the first two books, with text, brief apparatus, and elaborate commentary. In most cases the text is based upon those of Madvig and Müller, but some cases of divergence are carefully noted. To Madvig's epoch-making work Dr. Reid

is naturally greatly indebted, but his attitude is throughout entirely independent, and his own remarkable acquaintance with Ciceronian style and access to many helps not available to Madvig has justified his frequent dissent from the great Dane. Again, his familiarity with Epicurean sources has not infrequently caused him to disagree with the statements in Usener's *Epicurea*. In short, his notes display, upon all linguistic, legal, and philosophical questions, that authoritative yet judicial character so conspicuous in his classic edition of the *Academica*. With the modern literature he is less concerned; in fact, some of the notes seem to have been composed some years ago,¹ but this, as well as the lack of an introduction (which would have been of great help to the reader by discussing the sources and argument of the work), we must ascribe to the ill-health rather than the oversight of the editor.

To the very full notes a few trifling additions may be permissible. On page 15 to the passages on the comparative richness of the Latin and Greek languages add those listed in my note on *De Div.* 2, 11. On page 28 (*Fin.* 1, 19) might the difficulty caused by the word *itaque* perhaps be solved by transposing it with *ita* in the next line? In the discussion of suicide (p. 74) the important study by Hirzel (*Arch. f. Relig.* XI [1908], 75-104, 243-84, 417-76) might well be cited. With the complaints against the Epicureans in 1, 12 (p. 116) cf. *N.D.* 1, 74; to the quasi-deification of Epicurus by his followers (p. 127) add *N.D.* 1, 43; with the argument of 2, 30 cf. *N.D.* 1, 115; with 2, 43 cf. *N.D.* 1, 47. The triple division of Greeks, Romans, and barbarians (2, 49) may be compared with *De Div.* 1, 84; 2, 82; and the passages collected by Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren* (1923), 127, n. 151. On the *passer* as a type of the erotic (2, 75) a note might have been in place.

These, however, are but slight suggestions, and it is sincerely to be hoped that so significant a work may be extended to include the three subsequent books, as occasional references forward to notes upon Book III suggest. In any case, the present volume is a rich contribution from a great Ciceronian.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

AMHERST COLLEGE

Mutter Erde, ein Versuch über Volksreligion. Von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Dritte erweiterte Auflage besorgt von Eugen Fehrle. Leipzig: Teubner Verlag, 1925. Pp. 157. 6 M. (paper), 7 M. 60 pf. (bound).

The first edition of this contribution to classical folk-religion appeared in 1905 dedicated to Hermann Usener on his seventieth birthday. The second edition was brought out seven years later by Richard Wünsch of Königsberg,

¹ E.g., the Presocratics might well be cited from Diels rather than from Mullach, and Jerome's *Letters* from the edition of Hilberg rather than that of Migne.

who had already revised Dieterich's *Mithrasliturgie* in 1910. The text was left unaltered, Wunsch merely adding at the end several pages of supplementary matter based partly on Dieterich's papers, and, for the most part, on contributions to the subject, which had appeared in scientific journals during the intervening years. Now a third edition has appeared by Joseph Eugen Fehrle, since 1919 professor of classical philology and director of the Philological Seminary at Heidelberg, a scholar known from various contributions to philology, history, religion, and folklore. The text still remains unchanged, but the additional matter of Wunsch has increased, and the original two-page Index has been enlarged to nine pages.

Nearly one-half of the 121 pages of text is taken by the first two of the seven chapters, here expanded from articles which appeared in the *Archiv zur Religionswissenschaft* (VIII [1905], 1 f.). The starting point for the entire investigation is furnished by three curious rites of birth and death found in Roman folk-religion. First, a passage in Augustine's *De civ. dei* (IV, 11) speaks of a birth-goddess *Levana*, she who *levat de terra*, a phrase usually interpreted as lifting new-born babes from the ground to make them strong, or brought into connection with the Roman rite of a father, in token of paternity, lifting the new-born from the ground, where, however, the ordinary terms are *succipere* or *tollere*, and not *levare*. Secondly, Juvenal (XV, 139-40) speaks of the "earth closing over a babe too young for the funeral pyre," which recalls Pliny's reference (*H.N.*, VII, 72) to the custom of burying, and not burning, the bodies of the infants who died before cutting their teeth. Lastly, a passage from Lucilius, handed down by Nonius (p. 40, 25 f., Lindsay), speaks of the custom of laying sick people on the ground before expiring, "*depositus*" here, as in similar cases elsewhere in Latin literature, referring, as Man has shown (*Pauly-Wissowa Realencyclopädie*, III, I, 347), to the laying of the sick rather than of the dead upon the ground. With the help of a great number of analogous magic rites among peoples without historical connections, ancient and modern, from Italy to the American Indians, Dieterich refers these Roman rites to a widely distributed and primitive folk-belief in Earth as the mother of all mankind, out of whom the soul comes, and into whose bosom it returns to be protected until its reappearance on earth at a new birth. He concludes that the primitive belief in the act of birth was magical, since there was produced something which before was elsewhere, and that in accordance with it the soul was pre-existent, and the *κύκλος γενέσεων* a very old belief.

Various customs and rites hinted at in Greek literature from Homer to Pausanias indicate what primitive Attic folk-religion believed about Earth (*Ge*) as the mother of mankind, and about the mystery of birth and death (II). Though these indications are even clearer than in Italy, curiously no trace of the three Roman rites discussed have been found in Attica, even if they may have existed there. The best traces are found in the Orphics and in writers influenced by Orphism, notably Plato, whose picture of the soul-

life at the end of the *Republic* reflects much of primitive Attic folk-religion. Traces of a cult of "Earth" and of a "Mother" are also found in Greece outside of Attica (III), notably in the tradition of Earth oracles at Olympia, Delphi, Dodona, Aegae, etc., but very few of "Mother Earth." In the brief discussion of the cult of the Great Mother of Crete the author rightly doubts whether the belief in that deity was identical with that in Mother Earth. In this connection the earlier studies of Dussaud, Prinz, Jane Harrison, and Karo are noted, but nothing later than 1912. The possible connection between Mother goddesses and Earth goddesses—notably Demeter—is also discussed. Tellus and Terra and their cults in Rome are treated (IV), and the introduction of the *Magna Mater* from Asia into Greece as early as the "Hymn to Demeter" and into Rome by 204 B.C., and the later combination of her cult with those of Demeter and Isis, and still later with the mystery cults in general (V).

In the section on phallic worship in the Greek mysteries (VI) and in its analogies elsewhere, Dieterich rightly follows Amelung's lead (based on *Antigone*, 569) in interpreting as a phallus and a plough together the curious object shown in two similar groups pictured on a black-figured vase in the Archaeological Museum at Florence (figs. on pp. 107-8), which long before Heydemann had regarded merely as a primitive plough (*Stes Hallesche Winckelmannsprogramm*, 1879). He also regards the Rhea epigram from Phaestos (*Mon. ant. dei Lincei*, XI [1901], 542 f.) as a sacramental dedicatory ritual. Finally, there is an altogether too brief account (VII) of the traces of ancient folk-beliefs about Mother Earth surviving the advent of Christianity, which appear in Christian writings, notably in Clement, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and especially in Paul's reasoning about the Resurrection (I Cor. 15:35 f.), where the apostle certainly drew on the old tradition of Mother Earth.

The reissue of this little work with the literature of its many problems brought down to date will be welcomed. It will continue to be a most valuable stimulus to the further investigation of primitive folk-beliefs in classical antiquity, even though the author's interpretation of so vast a mass of more or less related data from such varied sources ancient and modern will still provoke sharp differences of opinion.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Antike Gewichtsnormen und Münzfüsse. By OSKAR VIEDEBANTT.
Berlin: Weidmann, 1923. Pp. viii+166, 8vo. \$0.60.

In 1917 the author published his *Forschungen zur Metrologie des Altertums* in the Transactions of the Leipzig Academy. To that work this is to be considered a second volume. The author gratefully acknowledges that the munificence of a foreign friend has made its publication possible. At the date of

its preparation, to be sure, German publishers, like the German public, were dolefully pleading poverty, and were not at all averse to letting the victorious, and presumably plethoric, foreigners pay as much as possibly could be elicited of the costs of the war. But more recently the rich output of books and the foundation of new periodicals in that country might seem to indicate that it is time for despondency to cease.

The earlier work had no sooner been issued than the protagonists of the old school of metrologists, especially Lehmann-Haupt and Haeberlin and Kubitschek, rose in their wrath, and essayed to smite down the heretic. They would not stand by and see time-honored theories, consecrated by such noble names as Boeckh, and Mommsen, and Hultsch, to say nothing of their own, treated as if still uncertain and open to discussion. Viedebant, on the other hand, is not easily affrighted. He has courage, at any rate. His book is a mixture of constructive argument and of what I suppose we must call polemic. But it is polemic of a good sort, and it is in general effective. My sympathy is in the main with him as against his adversaries, though the controversy is altogether too complex to lend itself even to judicial summary in the space available in this journal. It must be enough to commend the book to careful and unprejudiced reading by those who are interested in such fundamental themes; and it is to be hoped that students of this sort are increasing in numbers.

The writer's style deserves all praise. He knows how to express himself, even on such an abstruse topic and in such a language as German, with clearness as well as vigor, with frankness that, all things considered, is singularly free from acerbity; and he never fails to be interesting. I must remark that in the field of Roman coinage one might wish that he could have been acquainted with some of the views that have more recently been set forth by some of the English numismatists. For example, Mr. H. Mattingly appears to have thrown entirely new and welcome light on the dark subject of the Romano-Campanian coinage.

E. T. M.

Catullus in English Poetry. By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT. "Smith College Classical Studies," Number 6. Menasha: George Banta Publishing Company, 1925.

Miss Duckett has collected and the Banta Press has admirably printed on excellent paper this convenient repertory of Catullan translations, imitations, "allusions" in the eighteenth-century sense, and reminiscences from Gascoigne's and Skelton's Philip Sparrow to Andrew Lang's *Catullus to his Book*, Edna St. Vincent Millay's "Death devours all lovely things," James Elroy Flecker's rendering of the Phaselus, Eugene Field's *Catullus to Lesbia*, and

Hummel and Brodribb's *Lays from Latin Lyres* which reproduced *Chommoda dicebat* by

But tidings came that grieved us bitterly—
That 'Arry, while he stayed at Rome,
Enjoyed his 'oliday in Hitaly.

Some of them, as she says, cannot claim to have been inspired by the bard of Sirmio, but "tell the same tale"—notably the somewhat far-fetched-in Shakespearean sonnets, the lure of whose beauty I suppose she could not resist. This anthology is adequate for the needs of the ordinary teacher and student of literature. But no such collection can be complete, especially if it aims to include parallels and poems that only tell the same tale. And if I amuse myself with a few random added notes it is with no intention of censure. The *passer* was translated by R. D. Blackmore, *British Quarterly*, LV, 94. "The same tales" should surely include Matthew Arnold's "Poor Matthias" and the reminiscence of Tennyson's

and as a parrot turns
Up through gilt wires a crafty, loving eye
And takes a lady's finger with all care
And bites it for true heart and not for harm.

To the twenty-three imitations of *vivamus, mea Lesbia* might be added that of Daniel which Sir Sidney Lee who does not mention Catullus thinks is a close translation of Tasso. But Daniel's "comes *once* to set" is enough to show that he is thinking of Catullus' *semel* which has no equivalent in Tasso. The flower cut down by the plow is illustrated by Burns's "To a Mountain Daisy." But the many passages from English poetry that derive from *purpureus veluti cum flos*, *Aeneid* ix. 435, would be hardly less pertinent. There are versions of *cenabis bene* and of some others by Lovelace. "All nose" as well as "all eare" can be found in Herrick. In *O colonia* the girl *adservanda nigerrimis diligentius vis* might recall Landor's

The blackest of grapes with a footpath hardby
Should scarcely be watched with so watchful an eye
As that kid of a girl whom old Aegon has made
His partner for life nor ashamed nor afraid.

Not to speak of Suckling's bride

No grape that's kindly ripe could be
So round, so plump, so soft as she
Nor half so full of juice.

The charming *Dianae sumus in fide* is omitted. It might have been well represented by Jebb's translation. In 38 the *Lacrimis Simonideis* invite illustrations from Wordsworth and others. The *egelidos tepores* of 46 perhaps suggested Pope's "tepid vespers of the spring." It would be unreasonable to ask for all the wedding songs that in some measure recall *collis o Heliconii*. But

the illustrations of *ut flos in saeptis* should certainly have included Sir Robert Ayton's "the morning rose that untouched stands" and the well-known passage in Pope's *Dunciad*. In 68 *quae dulcem curis miscet amaritatem* perhaps suggested Herrick's "the sweets of love are mixed with tears." Catullus' lament for his brother should be compared with Matthew Arnold's "a southern night." In 86 *nulla in tam magno est corpore mica salis* reminds us of Tennyson's "Maud, she has neither savor nor salt." The wistful "if" of *si quidquam mutis* at least calls for Tennyson's "if any care for what is here," his "if aught of things that here befall" and Swinburne's "but thou if anything endure."

The galliambics—that way madness lies. Yet something should be said of the famous meter. Christ actually dubs it a catalectic Ionic tetrameter. An eminent American scholar told me it was his habit to illustrate it for his students by Locksley Hall! The imitations of Meredith and Tennyson evidently are concerned mainly with getting the general effect of the polysyllabic run of short syllables at the end. They often give the rest of the line in descending quasi-trochaic measure. The meter, normally ascending, is really quite simple if you take it rightly. It is a mixture of anapaests and iambs or their equivalent with a resolution that gives a run of short syllables something with this effect:

The Catullan galliambic with its sudden syllable fall
Is a meter hard to measure by a scansion accentual.
It was tried by Meredith boldly and by laureate Tennyson
But though neither quite succeeded I am certain it can be done.

PAUL SHOREY

BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere bibliographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

The Size of the Slave Population at Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries before Christ. By RACHEL LOUISA SARGENT, Northwestern College, Naperville, Illinois. "University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences," Vol. XII, No. 3. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1924.

Boeck's estimate of 365,000 slaves for Attica has long been accepted by casual writers who paint an alluring picture of a free population whose sole occupation was to talk politics and philosophy in the lounging places of the agora and to sit in the law courts, the ecclesia, and the theater when they were

not fighting their neighbors. In recent years there has been a marked tendency among scholars familiar with the economic conditions of Greece to reduce Boeck's figures very considerably. Wallon puts the number at 200,000 and Beloch at 60,000 to 100,000. By striking general averages on the basis of a thorough re-examination of the evidence Miss Sargent has sought to determine the number of slaves (a) in domestic service, (b) in agriculture, (c) in industry, (d) in the service of the state. Accepting Beloch's estimate of the free population in the age of Pericles she puts the slaves at 97,000, and on the basis of Meyer's estimate, 73,000. For the early fourth century she estimates from 60,000 to 70,000. References to the use of slaves in war are few, but one wonders if the statement of Thucydides that each of the 3,000 hoplites engaged in the siege of Potidaea received a daily allowance of a drachma for his attendant, and other less explicit information might not have been helpful in checking some of the results. It required courage to face the task of working over such a mass of material without the prospect of securing any new evidence, but the substantial and convincing results obtained are ample justification for the undertaking. It is another illustration of the truth that the new methods of treating old straw often yield profit in classical philology.

ROBERT J. BONNER

An Anthology of Medieval Latin. Chosen by STEPHEN GASELEE, librarian and keeper of the papers at the Foreign Office, fellow of Magdalene College. Macmillan and Company, 1925. Pp. xii+139. Price 7s. 6d.

This volume contains an extremely interesting series of selections chosen, as the author tells us, in the course of desultory reading, with a view to the requirements and interest of the general reader. The selections, forty-five in number, are, however, not confined to the medieval period; there are Pompeian and other vulgar Latin inscriptions, passages from the *Cena* of Petronius, the *Itala*, Ambrose, and the *Perigrinatio* of Etheria as well as representatives from each century from the sixteenth to the twentieth. Of the forty-five selections, fifteen are poetical, representing about twenty pages of text.

The student who is thoroughly grounded in classical Latin or has some familiarity with medieval Latin will have little difficulty with most of the selections, but the book will not prove easy reading for most beginners in this field. There are practically no syntactical notes; many words occur that are not to be found in a Latin lexicon; the student must occasionally use a Greek dictionary or DuCange; and a few words occur that are not found even in these works. The notes are brief and to the point, but they make one wish there were more of them. One error should be corrected; the translation of

casulas, in the Petronius selection (p. 8) as "top-coats" is incorrect; the word is, of course, a diminutive of *cosa* and means "shacks"; cf. chap. 77, *aedificavi hanc domum. ut scitis, casula erat; nunc templum est.*

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Martianus Capella. Edited by A. DICK. Leipzig: Teubner. Pp. xxxiv+570.

The text of *Martianus Capella* is one of those the study of which has drifted into the backwater of philological endeavor. This at once becomes evident when it is realized that it is sixty years since Eyssenhardt's edition appeared and the brief bibliographical list compiled by Dick reveals an astonishingly small number of scholars who have concerned themselves with this author whose work played such an important rôle in the Middle Ages.

Dick's edition marks a great advance over its predecessor. Eyssenhardt used only three MSS and one of these only in exceptional cases. The other two were derived from the same (ninth century?) archetype. The text, therefore, rested on a very insecure foundation. In addition, it appears that Eyssenhardt was not always careful in reporting the readings of his MSS. Dick's text is based on seven MSS that contain the whole or the greater part of the text and a half-dozen other MSS that contain only parts. It is significant that all the MSS are from Swiss or German libraries with the exception of three Leyden codices. In addition, seven MSS, all German or Swiss except two *Ambrosiani*, were examined but found to be without value. Dick apparently accepted Eyssenhardt's verdict as to the value of the Vatican and Paris MSS, for he has disregarded them. He was unable to secure permission to examine Eyssenhardt's Darmstadt MS, now in the cathedral library at Cologne. Most of the sixty MSS listed in Eyssenhardt's edition (some, to be sure, from old manuscript catalogues) have thus been disregarded and no thorough search has been made for new material. Dick admits the possibility *ut in immenso codd. Martianeorum numero vetustior et praestabilior quam mei essent aliquando inventretur.*

Though Dick, therefore, has not furnished the material for reconstructing the history of the text he has undoubtedly brought us much nearer to the archetype. The apparatus is full and enables the paleographer to form a fairly clear idea as to the course of the tradition, at least as far as the MSS represented are concerned. Especially valuable is the indication of the sources of *Martianus*.

The editor has been conservative in handling the text. The small number of MSS used has forced him to be eclectic in the choice of his readings, but these decisions carry the weight of a judgment that has been ripened by the study of the author extending over thirty years.

The book is provided with an elaborate *Index rerum et nominum*, a brief *Index auctorum*, and a table of parallel pages of the new edition and Eyssenhardt's. Minor typographical errors occur in the apparatus on pages 23, 93, 190, and 230.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Les plaidoyers écrits et les plaidoiries réelles de Cicéron. By JULES HUBERT. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1925.

This interesting book bases itself on the theory that the Procedure of the Republic created an entirely different situation for the orator from that of Greek and Roman practice in which the defendant speaks last after the evidence is all in. In Cicero's day the speeches preceded the evidence, the orator's time was practically unlimited, and in important cases the work was distributed to several advocates, some of whom undertook the detailed argument on the charges and specific issues of fact, while to Cicero were usually left the general introduction and the peroration. In writing up his speeches for publication Cicero recast in one oration his own contribution to this collective task, but sacrificed conformity with Greek models and theory to his wish to preserve a record for initiated Roman readers of the actual course of the trial, the legal strategy, and the conduct of the case. Ignorance of these facts invalidates much modern criticism, which assumes a single speech by Cicero, delivered on one day covering the entire case, and judges it by its failure to meet the demands of either Greek art or modern legal logic.

I have not yet tested in detail Professor Humbert's analysis of the orations, his criticism (courteous for the rest) of Zumpt, Poiret, Norden, Rosenberg, Opperskalski, and Laurand or his argument that the second book of the *de Oratore* expounds Roman practice rather than Greek theory. I expect to do so in a course which I am giving on the literary criticism and rhetoric of the ancients. His handling of the evidence occasionally excites my suspicions. His pressing of *nuper* in *Pro Cluentio* 6 does not seem to me to prove that Sassia was not then present at the trial. And the rhetorical questions in 65 hardly prove that she then was. But however that may be, he seems to have made out his general case. At all events he knows his Cicero and the modern literature of the subject and I shall look forward eagerly to his promised volume on the political orations.

PAUL SHOREY

M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Secundus. By ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE. "University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Volume VIII, Numbers 1 and 2. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1923.

This belated notice can only call attention again to a valuable work and repeat what was said of the edition of the first book (*Class. Phil.*, 1922, p. 171).

Professor Pease's annotation is sane, erudite, and copious. He is up to date on all relevant literature; he evades no difficulties, politely rejects superfluous emendations, comments adequately on points of Latin and Ciceronian usage and the possible Greek philosophic sources, and his industry lets itself go in a paroxysm of bibliography and citations on such topics as the blind Teiresias (p. 360), the size of the sun (p. 361), the fallacy of the liar and the Sorites, the resources of Latin compared with Greek, the wheel of fortune (p. 373), astrology, where he was apparently too late to use Thorndike's history of magic and experimental science, the death of Pompey "in solitudine Aegyptiorum" (p. 385), the impossibility of escaping fate (p. 390), the philosopher who sees not what is before his feet (p. 397), the etymology, botany, and folklore of Pulcium (p. 403), musical overtones (p. 405), the effects of the moon on sea animals (p. 406), the tides (p. 409), the doctrine of sympathy, the *ex nihilo* principle (p. 417), the omen of thunder (p. 474), the latency of the statue in the stone (p. 432), the origin of centaurs (p. 434), the Etruscan Tages (p. 435), Ennius' cock (p. 446), the peremnia (pp. 473-75), *acumina*, *sternumenta*, and other omens and rites, right and left in Greek and Roman usage (p. 482), the trinity of Fortune, Jove and Juno, twins and astrology (p. 502), the birthday of Rome, acrostichs (p. 529), the Delphic omphalus (p. 535), the ambiguities of oracles (p. 557), the obscurity of Heraclitus (p. 559), ancient riddles (p. 561), superstition and religion (pp. 579-81), sleep, a refuge (pp. 584-85).

Sixteen pages of addenda et corrigenda supplement these notes with further references brought down to date, and take careful account of the suggestions of reviewers of the first book. A bibliographical appendix of thirty pages catalogues manuscripts, editions, and translations less exhaustively than the modest author could wish, but quite sufficiently for this or any reasonable reviewer. A good index makes all available.

PAUL SHOREY

Plato, Diálogos. II. Cármides, Lisis, Protágoras. Text I Traducció de
JOAN CREXELLS. Barcelona: Fundació Bernat Metge, 1925.

At the meeting of the American Philological Association at Chicago during the World's Fair of 1893 when Professor Sonnenschein spoke of his pleasure and surprise at finding so much interest in classical scholarship "so far away," I shouted from the front bench "So far away from where?" Doubtless the cultured citizens of Barcelona and vicinity would be no less amused if a Chicagoan should express astonishment that they so far away from this center of classical philology and pork packing are able to finance and provide a membership of 1,200 (with a sale of three thousand volumes) for a society that publishes an admirable series of classical texts on better paper and with prettier type than we can afford with the Catalan *en regard*. I may at least be allowed to say *non equidem invideo; miror magis*.

Reversing the usual Budé-Loeb procedure I have with the aid of the

Greek made out enough of the Catalan to say confidently that the translation of Plato's *Protagoras* is accurate, and with a little more experience I might add what now I can only divine that it is also idiomatic and racy. This may seem a vicious circle but it is not really that. For to the first steps in the reading of Catalan as to many other things the Aristotelian maxim applies ἀ γὰρ δὲ μαθόντας ποιεῖν τὰτα ποιοῦντες μανθάνομεν.

PAUL SHOREY

Der Eleatische Satz vom Widerspruch. By SVEND RANULF. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1924.

More than the normal amount of labor and acumen has gone into this doctoral dissertation. It comes to me with a courteous inscription from the author. But if he has any acquaintance with my work he must know that however highly I may esteem his industry and ingenuity it is impossible for me to agree with him. I hold that Plato is, if possible, even greater as a reasoner than as an artist and that there are few if any fallacies in his writings that are not clearly justified by some didactic or dramatic purpose.

Dr. Ranulf's thesis seems to be that the dialogues of Plato, the treatises of Aristotle, and the philosophical writings of the ancients generally are replete with fallacies beyond all modern analogy. There are many other sophistries in the logic of Socrates as exhibited in the earlier Platonic dialogues, but the one which he thinks is systematically exploited is what he calls the *Voraussetzung der Absoluten Vieldeutigkeit* which seems to mean in practice little more than playing on the double meanings of words. Plato himself explicitly tells us in the *Euthydemus* and the *Phaedrus* that this is the chief cause of error and confusion in untrained minds. But Dr. Ranulf refuses to accept my inference that in the dramatic illustration of this kind of reasoning Plato knew what he was about. He thinks that what he regards as the "fallacies" in the *Charmides*, *Laches*, *Lysis*, and similar dialogues represent a sceptical or Socratic stage in Plato's development in which the sophisms that lead to contradictory or no conclusions were regarded as unanswerable antinomies of human reasoning. Much of his criticism of Plato's arguments is, I believe, captious or rests on misapprehensions. I think I could convince him of this in a three months' seminar with all the texts of Plato and Aristotle and especially the *Topics* before us. But I could not do it in the space available here and will not try. Yet I cannot forbear to protest once more against the persistent misapprehension of Plato's attitude toward Prodicus which, after Grote and Gomperz, Dr. Ranulf shares with all the world. Yet the facts are plain. Plato was not unfriendly to Prodicus, but Prodicus' discrimination of synonyms, however useful for rhetoric and style, had little to do with the distinguishing for logical purposes of essentially different meanings and Plato was justified in laughing at it when it was irrelevantly obtruded in philosophical discussion.

PAUL SHOREY

Feste e Poesie Antiche. By CARLO PASCAL. Milan: Fratelli Treves, 1926.

These are pleasant essays, some of them reprints. "Feste Antiche di Primavera" goes back from modern Italy and a young man's fancy in the spring to the myth of Adonis and the fifteenth Idyl of Theocritus. "Mater Dolorosa" reprints the text of that poem and studies the general motive in the episode of Nisus and Euryalus and elsewhere. "Socrate in Commedia" carries the theme on to modern Italian developments including a tragedy and parody of Alfieri. "Pasquinate in Roma Antica" collects examples from Suetonius, Martial, and the Augustan histories. "L'Abbandono di Roma nei Poeti dell'Eta Augustea" controverts Giordani's fancy that Virgil's purpose was to support the plan of removing the Capital of the Empire to the East.

PAUL SHOREY

Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning. Mankind, Nation, and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View. By OTTO JESPERSEN. Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co., 1925.

All educated men are interested in language, have experimented with it, reflected on it, and think they understand something of its psychology and its illogical or alogical logic. Any ready writer can make such reflections, properly seasoned with anecdotes and etymologies, interesting. But they command special attention when the ready writer is like Professor Jespersen also a student of the science of language whose mind is a storehouse of apposite illustrations of his thoughts. Those to whom the subject is new will derive much instruction and entertainment from these lectures. Readers of any one of half a dozen popular works that might be named will be less surprised and may be tempted to cavil at the disproportion between the content of the book and its ambitious title. Professor Jespersen, of course, throws out some suggestions and lets fall many *obiter dicta* which would give a professional philologist or metaphysician an opening for discussion. But *Classical Philology* must limit itself to this notice.

PAUL SHOREY

